SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 03473 6166

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 1223 03473 6315

5/5

*San Francisco Public Library*

Government Publications Center
San Francisco Public Library
100 Larkin Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102

REFERENCE BOOK

*Not to be taken from the Library*

LGT-2903
LGT-2909

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

**NOTICE OF 1ST MEETING**
**MONDAY, MAY 17,1999**
**5:30 P .M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 508**
**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **PRESENTATION TO THE AUTHORITY BY SUPERVISOR MICHAEL Y AKI**
   **Presentation and discussion only of legislation of concourse authority by Supervisor Michael Yaki**

3. **PRESENTATION ON OPEN MEETING REQUIREMENTS**
   **Presentation by the City Attorney and discussion only of the requirements of the Sunshine Ordinance and the Brown Act.**

4. **GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY ADOPTION OF BYLAWS**
   **Discussion and possible action to adopt the Bylaws for the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.**

5. **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**
   **Election of President, Vice President, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer of the Authority pursuant to Article VII of the Bylaws.**

6. **GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY ADOPTION REGULAR MEETING LOCATION AND TIME**
   **Discussion and possible action to adopt a resolution providing for the holding of regular meetings and a fixed location and time of holding such meetings.**

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
   **At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on the agenda for this matter .**

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 831-2099

3 1223 03473 6166

3 1223 03473 6315

45
2
/17/99

# MINUTES OF FIRST MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

**The directors named by the incorporator of the Authority, constituting the board of directors of the Authority, held their first meeting at the time, on the day, and at the place set forth as follows:**

**Time: 5:30 p.m.**
**Date: May 17, 1999**
**Place: Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, CA**

**The following directors, constituting the full board were present at the meeting:**

**Marilyn Hope Smulyan**
**Nancy Rowe Conner**
**John Rizzo**
**Tammy B. Haygood**
**John Lum**
**Margaret O'Sullivan**
**Stephanie Chase MacColl**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

NOV 2 4 1999

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**A quorum was present.**

**The following individuals were also present:**

**Supervisor Michael Yaki**
**Mariam Morley, Deputy City Attorney**
**Theresa Alvarex, Deputy City Attorney**
**Margaret McArthur, Staff**
**Daria Schwarzschild, Staff**

**Supervisor Yaki made a presentation to the directors of the Authority on the contents of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act, the ordinance that authorized and directed the creation of the Authority.**

**A form of the bylaws was presented to the directors of the Authority for consideration and discussion. Theresa Alvarez and Mariam Morley from the Office of the City Attorney were available to answer questions by the directors on the bylaws.**

**On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the following resolutions were adopted:**

**IT IS RESOLVED THAT the bylaws presented and discussed at this meeting are adopted as the bylaws of the Authority; and**

4 49383 SFPL: ECONO JRS
75 SFPL 06/06/03 51

IT IS FURTHER RESOVLED THAT the secretary of the Authority is authorized and directed to execute a certificate of adoption of those bylaws, to insert them as so certified in the minute book of the Authority, and to ensure that a copy of the bylaws, similarly certified, is kept at the principal office for the transaction of business of the Authority.

At the meeting, the board of directors elected a president, a vice president and secretary. The following persons were duly nominated and elected to the offices indicated before their names to serve for one year or until their respective successors are duly elected and qualified, whichever occurs later:

President: Nancy Rowe Connor
Vice President: Tammy B. Haygood
Secretary: John Rizzo

The board of directors of the Authority determined that the Chief Executive Officer would be a paid staff position. The financial aspects of this position would be overseen by the Treasurer of the board. The board also determined that the President of the Authority would work with the City Attorney's office to decide how to proceed with the hiring of the Chief Executive Officer.

The presentation on Open Meeting requirements was put over as an attorney with the City Attorney's office specializing in these requirements was not available.

The board of directors directed staff to mail to the existing Golden Gate Master Plan mailing list in regard to being placed on the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority mailing list.

The following members of the public spoke during public comment: Steven Willis asked whether the Authority could dissolve itself if it determined that its objectives and mission, as set forth in the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act, went beyond the scope of good environment planning for San Francisco. Steve Willis also spoke on the Authority and the project it is responsible for and the Transit First Policy. Jim Iverson spoke of his concerns of fitting the golden Gate Master Plan and the Transit First Policy into the Authority's responsibilities. Katherine Roberts also spoke on the Golden Gate Master Plan, the removal of parking spaces, the Transit First Policy and work being conducted in the park. Tomasita Medal spoke in support of the garage and keeping the deYoung and the Academy of Sciences in the Park.

There being no further business, on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Date:

_____
John Rizzo
Secretary

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 08 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF 2nd REGULAR MEETING**
**MONDAY, JULY 19, 1999**
**5:30 P .M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**
**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**
2. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
3. **ACCEPTANCE OF GIFT OF "THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE PARKING GARAGE REPORT" AND "THE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION" V ALUED IN EXCESS OF $75.000**
   **Discussion and possible action to accept from Warren Hellman and George Hume a gift of "The Golden Gate Park Concourse Parking Garage Report" prepared by Bechtel and "The Geotechnical Investigation" subcontracted by Bechtel to Treadwell and Rollo.**
4. **FUTURE PRESENTATION BY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**
   **Discussion and possible action to develop a list of topics for next month's Transportation Authority presentation to the Concourse Authority.**
5. **ELECTION OF TREASURER**
   **Discussion and possible action to elect a Treasurer .**
6. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
   **At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.**
7. **ADJOURNMENT**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 831-2099

45
2
19/99

# MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

The June meeting of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority was cancelled at the call of the President.

The regular meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held at 5:30 p.m. on July 19, 1999, at Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, CA.

The following directors, constituting the board were present at the meeting: Marilyn Hope Smulyan; Nancy Rowe Conner; John Rizzo; Tammy B. Haygood; John Lum; Stephannie Chase MacColl. The following director was absent: Margaret O' Sulllivan. A quorum was present.

The President of the Concourse Authority called the meeting to order. She reported that $11 million had been pledged to date from fundraising and will be deposited in the Community Initiatives Fund at the San Francisco Foundation. She reminded the Authority that its objectives are to beautify and enhance the natural and scenic landscape of concourse area, to assure access by the public to the park and to provide environmental and landscape improvements to enhance the experience of visitors to the park. The Authority's tasks include: building an underground parking facility; creating surface improvements to the area with the hope of creating a pedestrian oasis; and developing a feasibility and implementation plan for transit, traffic and infrastructure improvements.

Michael Chow from Bechtel Corporation spoke on the work conducted in the park that was managed by Bechtel. He explained that the work was intended to generate information that would be useful to initiate the design process of the underground parking facility. He then made a presentation to the Authority on "The Golden Gate Park Concourse Parking Garage Report" prepared by Bechtel and spoke briefly on the "The Geotechnical Investigation" subcontracted by Bechtel to Treadwell and Rollo.

Members of the public who spoke on this item were: Steven Willis who spoke of his concerns of whether a car-free area would be achievable with this design; Art Michel requested that he have an opportunity to present a proposal of bringing the historical G Line into the park; Michael Smith explained why they would like to bring the G Line into the park; James Beck spoke on the feasibility study; Chris Duderstadt requested that the Authority keep in mind the tunnel structure that exists in the park already when the garage is designed; and David Miles requested that the Authority keep all information as open as possible.

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

NOV 24 1999

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**RESOVLED**, that the directors of the Authority do accept from Warren Hellman and George Hume a gift of "The Golden Gate Park Concourse Parking Garage Report" prepared by Bechtel and "The Geotechnical Investigation" subcontracted by Bechtel to Treadwell and Rollo that were presented and discussed at this meeting which are valued in excess of $75,000. The directors are accepting only the information in these reports.

The board discussed issues that they would request the Transportation Authority to address in its presentation at the next board meeting.

At the meeting, the board of directors elected Tammy Haygood to serve as Treasurer of the Authority. She was duly nominated and elected to serve a one year term or until her respective successor is duly elected and qualified, whichever occurs later.

Under Commissioners' matters, Director Smulyan sought clarification on the approval of the minutes from the first meeting, on the budget and requested that the Authority change the date of their meeting in September because of the Jewish Holiday. She also requested that an item be placed on the next meeting to discuss the budget of the Authority.

The following members of the public spoke under public comment: Steven Willis sought clarification on when a presentation would be made to the Authority on the Sunshine Ordinance and read a request from the Alliance of Golden Gate Park. Jim Iverson spoke on his concerns of complying with the Sunshine Ordinance and asked that everything be made public. Katherine Roberts spoke in support of transit improvements and alternative transportation and the Propsition J requirements. Michelle Straton addressed her concerns of impacts on the neighborhood and that they be kept informed. Jane Nure addressed housekeeping issues.

There being no further business, on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Date:

_____

John Rizzo
Secretary

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

## NOTICE OF 3rd REGULAR MEETING
## MONDAY, AUGUST 16, 1999
## 5:30 P.M.
## CITY HALL, ROOM 408
## AGENDA

Fax Copy 1st Posted 8/12/99

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

AUG 13 1999

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **PRESENTATION OF OPEN MEETING REQUIREMENTS**
**Presentation by City Attorney and discussion only of the requirements of the Sunshine Ordinance and the Brown Act.**

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
**Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meetings of May 15, 1999 and July 19, 1999.**

4. **PRESENTATION BY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**
**Presentation and discussion only from the Transportation Authority in regard to issues concerning the Golden Gate Park, the Park Concourse Area and Park neighborhoods.**

5. **PRESENTATION BY RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT**
**Presentation and discussion only by the Recreation and Park Department on anticipated changes in Golden Gate Park circulation as a result of the adoption of the Golden Gate Park Master Plan.**

6. **APPROVAL OF FIRST QUARTER REPORT**
**Discussion and possible action to approve the First Quarter Report.**

7. **DISCUSSION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**
**Discussion only of future items members recommend come before the Authority.**

8. **COMMISSIONERS' ITEMS**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 221-8034

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.**

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

45
2
1/16/99

# MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

The regular meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held at 5:38 p.m. on August 16, 1999, at Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, CA.

The following directors, constituting the board were present at the meeting: Marilyn Hope Smulyan; Nancy Rowe Conner; John Rizzo; Tammy B. Haygood; John Lum; Margaret O' Sulllivan. The following director was absent: Stephanie Chase MacColl A quorum was present.

The President of the Authority called the meeting to order.

Jackie Minor, Deputy City Attorney gave a presentation on the California State Open Meeting Laws and the City's Sunshine Ordinance and stated that both applied to the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. Following her presentation she answered questions of the Board Members.

The Authority reviewed the minutes from the previous two meetings and made amendments to these minutes.

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the resolution below was adopted:

**RESOLVED**, That the Authority does approve the minutes of the Regular Meetings dated May 15, 1999 and July 19, 1999 as amended.

Peter Albert with the San Francisco Transportation Authority gave a presentation on the County-Wide Transportation Plan. He explained that their project was to try and pull together the first long range comprehensive transportation plan. He discussed the workshops that were held in the neighborhoods and also discussed the five themes for this project: 1) livable city, 2) economically thriving city, 3) equitable city, 4) regional city and 5) sustainable city. After his presentation he answered questions of the Board Members.

Michael Smith spoke on the G-Line and requested that Market Street Railway be allowed to make a presentation to the Authority, Ann Lanzerotti spoke on alternative ideas for public transportation, Steve Willis with the Alliance for Golden Gate Park spoke in regard to "Potential Acts in Concepts Circulation" by DKS Associates and the graphic that was created for the public for Prop. J and Jim Iverson with the Alliance for Golden Gate Park stated that the Authority needed to get more busses.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

NOV 2 4 1999

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

At 6: 40 p.m. Board Member John Lum requested he be excused for the remainder of the meeting.

Deborah Learner, Park Planner with the Recreation and Park Department, gave a presentation on the Golden Gate Master Plan. She stated that although there was a transportation emphasis the Authority will be looking at the music concourse in its entirety in relation to Golden Gate Park. She gave an overview of the objectives and policies of the Golden Gate Park Master Plan, in particular those that focused on the music concourse area. She also stated that the music concourse special area plan in the Golden Gate Park Master Plan was not approved, but deferred for possible study. It is the hope that the Concourse Authority will review what was proposed and incorporate many of those recommendations in their report. At that point it would come back to the Recreation and Park Commission for approval. She also went over specific items that the Department is trying to implement in the Master Plan. Following her presentation she answered questions of the Board Members.

Board President Nancy Conner presented the First Quarter Report.

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the resolution below was adopted:

**RESOVLED,** That the Authority does approve the First Quarter Report.

Board Members requested the following items be brought to the Authority: MUNI to make a presentation on their plans for Golden Gate Park , the G-Line proposal, the Bicycle Coalition, the Police Department in regard to enforcing the speed limit. President Nancy Conner asked Board Member Marilyn Smulyan to define the options available to produce a Traffic Feasibility and Implementation Study. Vice President Tammy Haygood announced that from this meeting forward there would be a budget report as a regular item on the agenda. Board Member Marilyn Smulyan also clarified that an item would be on the next agenda to approve a budget, an item on hiring and executive director and an item to determine what needs to be accomplished to set up website.

John Laskin spoke under public comment on the removal of those parking spaces as required in Proposition J in Golden Gate Park.

Deputy City Attorney Jackie Minor discussed Item Number 8 and what information could be shared under this item

Board Member Smulyan suggested that there be two special meetings – one on the job description and hiring of the executive director and the other to serve as the regular meeting.

There being no further business, on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Date:

_____

John Rizzo
Secretary

45
1
1/27/99
special
4

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING**
**MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 27,1999**
**5:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408 AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   **Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meetings of August 16, 1999.**

3. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER APPROVAL OF JOB DESCRIPTION**
   **Discussion and possible action to approve the job description for the Chief Executive Officer of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.**

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER APPROVAL TO PROCEED WITH HIRING PROCESS**
   **Discussion and possible action to approve the hiring process for the Chief Executive Officer of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.**

5. **APPROV AL OF ANNUAL BUDGET FY 1999-00**
   **Discussion and possible action to approve the Annual Budget for FY 1999-00.**

6. **PRESENT A TION OF OPTIONS A V AILABLE TO PRODUCE A TRAFFIC AND TRANSIT FEASIBILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION STUDY**
   **Presentation by Board Member Smulyan and discussion only on options that are available to produce a Traffic Feasibility and Implementation Study.**

7. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
   **This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time.**

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
   **At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 831-2099

F
15
2
7/99

# MINUTES OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

The special meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held at 5:35 p.m. on September 27, 1999, at Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, CA.

The following directors, constituting the board were present at the meeting: Nancy Rowe Conner; Tammy B. Haygood; Stephanie Chase MacColl; Margaret O'Sulllivan; John Rizzo and Marilyn Hope Smulyan. Board Member John Lum was absent. A quorum was present.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

The President of the Authority called the meeting to order

The Authority reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting.

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the resolution below was adopted:

RESOL VED, That the Authority does approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting dated August 16, 1999.

President Conner presented information on the job description of the Chief Executive Officer. The Authority had a detailed discussion on this item.

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the resolution below was adopted:

RESOL VED, That this Authority does approve the job description of the Chief Executive Officer in concept and in general form with the description amended to state that the CEO will effectively communicate the project information and carry out or implement the policies adopted by this Authority.

President Conner presented information on the hiring process of the Chief Executive Officer. She then introduced Michael Lum, Director of Human Resources with the Recreation and Park Department who explained in detail the hiring process for the Chief Executive Officer of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority .He then answered questions of the Board Members.

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the resolution below was adopted:

RESOL VED, That this Authority does approve the hiring process for the Chief Executive Officer.

Item Number 5 was removed from calendar. Vice President Haygood explained that although there was not a budget in place the process had moved forward tremendously. However, there would be one for the next meeting. In addition she informed the Authority that there were private funds to be gifted and she requested that an item be on the next agenda to accept or not accept this gift. There would be at least $50,000 in addition to the money needed for the feasibility study. Board Members then discussed this item and their concerns. The Authority requested information from the City Attorney on the money to be set aside each year philanthropic funds are received and for what purpose those funds may be used.

Board Member Smulyan presented a detailed memorandum and information on the options that are available to produce a Traffic Feasibility and Implementation Study. She summarized what was in Proposition J, listed those items that the study is to include, and the City departments that the Authority should be consulting. She discussed putting together a timetable and stated that the plan specifies the amount of money available. Although the Authority must consider everything listed in the ordinance there may be additional items the Authority may want to consider. She recommended first looking at the Master Plan as some items may have already been taken care of. Board member Smulyan stated that a decision would need to be made on who is going to create the plan and gave the Board options. The Board then had a detailed discussion on how to proceed and questioned whether they should wait until a Chief Executive Officer has been hired before proceeding. They requested public comment on this portion of the item. The following members of the public commented: Tomasita Medal spoke on public hearings and Deborah Friedman with the de Young urged the Authority to move forward and not wait to bring staff on board.

*The taping system became nonfunctional at this point in the meeting.*

Board Member Smulyan suggested that the Authority determine how other departments can assist for the next meeting. She suggested that Deborah Learner should come back and go into the Master Plan in more detail. The Authority requested that they receive a copy of the Golden Gate Park Master Plan.

Under Directors' Business Board Member O'Sullivan stated that a Richmond resident had told her of concerns over the proposed entrance to the garage at 10th and Fulton because of the playground located there. She requested an item be put on the agenda in regard to preserving the playground and beautifying and preserving the pedestrian tunnel. Board Member Rizzo stated that the Environment Commission was interested in having a public forum with the Authority and requested that this happen.

Under Public comment -Ann Lanzerotti urged the Authority to think globally about what the concourse should look like.

There being no further business, on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Date:

John Rizzo Secretary

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

F
AS
1
/18/99
2

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1999**
**5:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**
**AGENDA**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROV AL OF MINUTES**
   **Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meetings of September 27, 1999.**

3. **PRESENTATION OF PROPOSAL TO EXTEND THE HISTORIC STREETCAR G-LINE INTO GOLDEN GATE PARK**
   **Discussion and presentation only of a proposal by Art Michel of the Market Street Railway to extend the Historic Streetcar G-Line into Golden Gate Park.**

4. **PRESENTATION OF UPDATE IN PLANS OF THE DEYOUNG MUSEUM AND CALIFORNIA ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND COORDINATION WITH THE CONCOURSE AUTHORITY'S PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION OF UNDERGROUND PARKING GARAGE**
   **Discussion and presentation only of an update by the DeYoung Museum and the California Academy of Sciences on their plans and coordination with the Concourse Authority on the planning and construction of an underground parking garage.**

5. **PRESENTATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REVIEW PROCESS**
   **Discussion and presentation only or the Environmental Impact Review process and how it relates to the duties and responsibilities or the Concourse Authority.**

6. **PRESENTATION OF PRIOR TRANSPORTATION STUDIES OF GOLDEN GATE PARK AND DISCUSSION OF FUTURE COURSES TO ACCOMPLISH TRANSPORTATION FEASIBILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**
   **Discussion and presentation only by the Duffy Company of prior transportation studies effecting Golden Gate Park and future course of action to accomplish the Transportation Feasibility and Implementation Plan.**

7. **APPROV AL OF BUDGET FOR FY 1999-00**
   **Discussion and possible action to approve the Budget for FY 1999-00.**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 831-2099

8. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
   **This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time.**

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
   **At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.**

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

# MINUTES OF THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

/99

The regular meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held at 5:30 p.m. on October 18, 1999, at Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, CA.

The following directors, constituting the board were present at the meeting: Nancy Rowe Conner; John Lum; Stephanie Chase MacColl; Margaret 0' Sulllivan; John Rizzo Marilyn Hope Smulyan. The following director was absent: Tammy Haygood. A quorum was present.

The President of the Authority called the meeting to order.

The Approval of Minutes was put over until the November 15TH meeting because they were not available for review.

Michael Smith made a brief presentation and then introduced Art Michel. Art Michel, President of the Market Street Railway thanked the Authority and stated that he believed that the G-Line would compliment the garage. He then made a detailed presentation to the Authority. The proposal would be to use the existing F and N Line tracks to bring the cars out to comers of 9th and Irving -then approximately *½ mile* of double track would be built to bring them into the park with a terminal behind the bandshell where the tour busses now park. Summary the strengths are: the F Line has proven to be extremely popular as a magnet for passengers; it carries approximately 50% more passengers as the 8 Market Trolley coach carried previously; it would be identified with Golden Gate Park as a special destination; and it would use mainly make use of existing infrastructure and would require only a half mile of double track construction plus some switches to bring the cars from the F Line to the end and then to diverge from the N Line into the park. They then answered questions from the Authority, Peter Strauss with MUNI stated that MUNI views this as an interesting proposal and they would be willing to work with the advocates as the concept develops. He raised some of his concerns and then answered questions of the Authority. Norma Roth spoke on streetcars, their compatibility with parks and drawing more people to parks. Ann Lanzarretti opposed the G Line, Carolyn Blair with the S.F. Tree Council supported the G Line and Alex Landsberg spoke on a variety of issues in regard to the G Line. Tomasita Medal asked that the Authority not support the G Line.

President Conner apologized that the Academy of Sciences would not be at the meeting but stated that they were supportive of the actions of the Concourse Authority, Harry Parker made the presentation of the current plan of the deYoung Museum. He stated that the purpose of the garage is not to add parking but replace existing spaces. Although the Bechtel proposal is only one solution, he requested that there be public input of the Bechtel proposal. It would be a considerable benefit to the City if the planning and construction of the de young could be synchronized with the planning and construction of the underground garage. Mr. Parker then gave a status of construction of the de Young. He stated that they would like to start construction in 2002 and went through the construction schedule with the Authority. Board Member Smulyan stated that the Authority should make sure that there was good public notice, a good facilitator

SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY
MAY 0 8 2001
DOCUMENTS DEPT.

and the document out to the public for review before the workshop moves forward. He then answered questions of the Authority. President Connor stated that Don Alameda would be draw up a temporary schedule and list of tasks. She also stated that she thought it might be good if they could get a facilitator and resource person from Bechtel to make it a public workshop on the Bechtel plans. There was discussion of how to proceed with the EIR and how to best put together options the Authority would need to coordinate the three projects. Tomasita medal commented that these are private not public funds.

The Duffey Company suggested that they would like to assist in putting together an implementation action plan. David Peressi spoke on the work the Duffey Company has done in Golden Gate Park, Marilyn Duffey spoke on the shuttle service and Rebecca Kolhstrand spoke on transportation demand management. They then answered questions of the Authority. The Duffey Company recommended that the Authority, at their next meeting, publicly announce an implementation action plan. The Authority decided the next step would be to put out a Request for Proposal for an implementation action plan at the November meeting and have consultants come back to the Authority in December.

President Connor announced that item number six was put over until the next meeting. Board Member Smulyan offered to put together a draft budget.

President Conner presented the presentation of the acceptance of gift from the San Francisco Foundation.

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the resolution below was adopted:

RESOLVED, That this Authority does accept a gift in the amount of $100,000.00 form the operation of the Concourse Authority from the San Francisco Foundation Community Initiative Funds.

Under Director's Business, President Connor stated that the next quarterly report was due and should come to the Authority at the next meeting. She also thanked Michael Lum with the Recreation and Park Department for his assistance on the hiring process of a Chief Executive Director. There was discussion about the process for interviewing candidates. Board Member Smulyan again recommended that the Authority should make sure that there was good public notice, a good facilitator and the public document available before the workshop discussed earlier moved forward.

Under public comment, Ron Migual spoke to the Authority about their responsibilities and objectives and a timeline needed to accomplish these goals and objectives.

There being no further business, on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Date

John Rizzo Secretary

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

SF
AS
1
1/15/99

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1999**
**5:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**
**AGENDA**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROV AL OF MINUTES**
   **Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meetings of September 27,1999 and October 18,1999.**

3. **APPROVAL OF BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999-00**
   **Discussion and possible action to approve the Budget for Fiscal Year 1999-00.**

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER APPROV AL TO FORM A COMMITTEE TO REVIEW APPLICATIONS**
   **Discussion and possible action to approve the formation of a committee to review applications for the position of Chief Executive Officer .**

5. **APPROV AL OF PROPOSAL BY THE DUFFY COMPANY IN THE AMOUNT OF $48,520.00 TO PREP ARE A GOLDEN GATE PARK FEASIBILITY STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**
   **Discussion of a proposal from the Duffy Company to prepare, for consideration and approval by the Concourse Authority, a traffic, transit and infrastructure feasibility study and implementation plan, in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act, for the sum of $48,520.00, and possible action to:**
   1. **Request that the Department of Parking and Traffic include this scope of work in an existing contract; and**
   2. **Approve the transfer of $48,520.00 to the Department of Parking and Traffic; and**
   3. **Authorize a Board of Directors member to work with the staff of the Department of Parking and Traffic and to take all other steps necessary to ensure that work on the feasibility study and implementation plan can begin as soon as possible.**

6. **PRESENTATION OF SCHEDULE OF UNDERGROUND P ARKING FACILITY**
   **Presentation and discussion only of procedure and schedule for construction of the underground parking garage.**

7. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
   **This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time.**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 831-2099

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
**At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

/99

# MINUTES OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

The regular meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held at 5:38 p.m. on November 15, 1999, at Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, CA.

The following directors, constituting the board were present at the meeting: Nancy Rowe Conner; Tammy B. Haygood; John Lum; Stephanie Chase MacColl; Margaret O'Sulllivan; John Rizzo and Marilyn Hope Smulyan. A quorum was present.

DOCUMENTS DEPT

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

The President of the Authority called the meeting to order

The Authority reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting,

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the resolution below was adopted:

RESOLVED, That the Authority does approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting dated September 27,1999 and October 18,1999 as amended.

Vice President Haygood presented the budget for FY 1999-00. The Authority had a detailed discussion on this item and put over the vote on this item until Item number 5 on the agenda had been heard.

Board Member Rizzo presented item number 4, the approval to form a committee to review applications for the position of Chief Executive Officer.

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the resolution below was adopted:

RESOLVED, That this Authority does approve the formation of a committee up of Board Members John Rizzo, Stephanie MacColl and Margaret O'Sullivan to review applications for the position of Chief Executive Officer.

Board Member Smulyan presented item number 5 -approval of a proposal by the Duffy Company in the amount of $48,520.00 to prepare a Golden Gate Park Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan. Marilyn Duffy with the Duffy Company gave a summary of their proposal.

Michael Smith stated his concerns on the proposal and asked for clarification on some of those concerns.

Ann Lanzerotti also asked for clarification on as to which shuttle the proposal was referring, the effect of labeling all the busses going into the park and if the handicap access issue would be addressed.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried by a vote of 6- l, the resolution below was adopted:

RESOLVED, That this Authority does approve the proposal from the Duffy Company to prepare, for consideration and approval by the Concourse Authority, a traffic, transit and infrastructure feasibility study and implementation plan, in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act, for the sum of up to $48,520.00, and possible action to:

1. Request that the Department of Parking and Traffic include this scope of work in an existing contract; and
2. Approve the transfer of up to $48,520.00 to the Department of Parking and Traffic; and
3. Authorize a Board of Directors' member to work with the staff of the Department of Parking and Traffic and to take all other steps necessary to ensure that work on the feasibility study and implementation plan can begin as soon as possible.

The Authority returned to Item number 3—approval of the Budget for Fiscal Year 1999-00 for the purpose of a vote.

This item was put over.

President Conner gave a presentation on the procedure and schedule for the construction of the underground-parking garage.

Under Directors' Business the following items brought up: 1) days and times for meeting dates in the year 2000 and 2) a Website for the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.

Chris Duderstadt brought forward a proposal he requested the Authority consider.

There being no further business, on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Date:

John Rizzo Secretary

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

SF
G45
#1
2/20/99
Canceled
c 2

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

## NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF MEETING

THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY
MEETING
ON MONDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1999 AT 5:30 P.M.
AT
ROOM 408, CITY HALL

HAS BEEN CANCELLED

Fax Rec'd 12/7/99

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

DEC 1 3 1999

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 221-8034

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

## NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
## GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY
## THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 2000
## 4:30 p.m.
## CITY HALL, ROOM 408

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

JAN 27 2000

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

1. Roll Call

2. Public Comment on all matters pertaining to the closed session.

3. Closed Session pursuant to Government Code section 54957 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.10(b):

   PUBLIC EMPLOYEE APPOINTMENT/HIRING:
   EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY. Discussion of applications, interview and discussion of candidate(s), and possible action to submit candidate(s) to the Mayor for possible appointment to the position of Executive Director of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.

4. Reconvene in open session:

   Vote to elect whether to disclose any or all discussions held in closed session (San Francisco Administrative Code section 67.12(a) (Action Item)

5. General Public Comment on any matter within the Subject Matter Jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Parking Authority.

6. Adjournment

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2085**
**Fax: (415) 221-8034**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Commission Office at (415) 831-2750. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

**Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.ci.sf.ca.us. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact:**

**Sunshine Ordinance Task Force**
**Rachel Arnstine O'Hara, Clerk**
**City Hall, Room 362**
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place**
**San Francisco, CA 94102-4683**
**Office: (415) 554-6171**
**FAX: (415) 554-6177**
**Email: rachel_arnstineo'hara@ci.sf.ca.us**

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

45
1
8/00
special
3

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING**
**GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY**
**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2000**
**4:30 p.m.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

1. **Roll Call**

2. **Approval of Minutes**
   Discussion and possible action to approve minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 15, 1999.

3. **Presentation by City Architect Tony Irons On the Planning and Construction of Projects In Golden Gate Park's Music Concourse Area**
   Presentation and discussion only of City efforts to coordinate the planning and construction of projects in Golden Gate Park's Music Concourse area.

4. **Request for Further Reports, Studies or Plans Concerning Construction of an Underground Parking Facility in the Music Concourse Area of Golden Gate Park**
   Discussion and possible action to request that Mr. Warren Hellman and Mr. George Hume provide the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority with all studies, reports or plans they have commissioned concerning construction of an underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

5. **Presentation of Draft General Design Principles for Underground Parking Facility**
   Discussion only of draft general design principles for the underground parking facility in Golden Gate Park's Music Concourse area.

6. **Plan for Public Input on Underground Parking Facility Project Golden Gate Park-Music Concourse**
   Discussion only of ways to involve the public in the planning process of the underground parking facility project.

7. **Duffy Company Proposal to Prepare Golden Gate Park Feasibility Study And Implementation Plan**
   Discussion only on status of the Duffy Company proposal to prepare a Golden Gate Park Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan.

8. **Presentation on City Requirements for Preparation of the Authority's Annual Budget**
   Presentation by the Mayor's Budget Office on City requirements for preparation of the annual budget.

9. **Request for Review of Classification of Chief Executive Officer Position**
   Discussion and possible action to request that the Depar1;ment of Human Resources review the classification of the position of Chief Executive Officer of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority to ensure that compensation is commensurate with duties.

10. **Change of Regular Meeting Date and Time**
    Discussion and possible action to change regular meeting date from the third Monday of each month at 5:30 p.m. to a different date and time.

11. **Directors' Business**
    This item allows members of the Board of Directors to raise issues they wish to address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time.

12. **Public Comment**
    At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on the agenda.

13. **Adjournment**

F
45
8/00

# MINUTES OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

The regular meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held at 4:38 p.m. on February 8, 2000, in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, CA.

The following directors, constituting the board were present at the meeting: Nancy Rowe Conner; Tammy B. Haygood; John Lum; Stephanie Chase MacColl; Margaret O'Sulllivan; John Rizzo and Marilyn Hope Smulyan. A quorum was present

The President of the Authority called the meeting to order.

President Conner announced that item number 8 would be heard after the approval of the minutes.

The Authority reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the resolution below was adopted:

RESOLVED, That the Authority does approve the minutes of the Regular November 15,1999 as amended.

Matthew Hymel, Budget Director, Office of the Mayor answered questions of the Authority in regard to City requirements for preparation of the annual budget.

Tony Irons, City Architect made a detailed presentation to the Authority on the coordination of the planning and construction of projects in Golden Gate Park's Music Concourse area. After his presentation he answered questions of the Authority .

Board Member Smulyan explained why she requested an item on the agenda requesting further reports, studies or plans concerning construction of an underground parking facility in the Music Concourse Area of Golden Gate Park.

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That this Authority does request that a letter be sent to Mr. Warren Hellman and MI. George Hume requesting a copy of the Walker Report

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

and any other studies relating to the construction of an underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

President Conner made a presentation to the Authority on the draft general design principles for the underground parking facility in Golden Gate Park's Music Concourse area. The Authority then discussed these principles and made suggested changes and additions.

Michael Nure stated that the goals mention concerned only the garage but should include the access roads in and out of the garage and believed the document needed to be expanded. Chris Duderstadt stated that the Authority needed to consider the 96% of the people who use the concourse to get from the north side to the south side (traffic paths).

Board Member Rizzo made a presentation to the Authority on ways to involve the public in the planning process of the underground facility project. He then led a discussion of the Authority on this process.

Tomasita Medal spoke on the goals and questioned the two of the principles, stating that some were personal agendas as opposed to actual goals. Steve Willis stated he felt some items had already been determined. If this was correct, he questioned why the Authority was discussing public input. He suggested that the Authority invite the original Golden Gate Park members of the Citizens Advisory Committee who created the original Master Plan.

Board Member Smulyan gave an update to the Authority on the status of the Duffy Company proposal to prepare a Golden Gate Park Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan.

President Conner explained the request for the Department of Human Resources review the classification of the position of Chief Executive Officer of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority to ensure that compensation was commensurate with duties.

On motion duly made, seconded, and carried the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That this Authority does request the Department of Human Resources review the classification of the position of Chief Executive Officer of the Authority to ensure that compensation was commensurate with duties.

President Conner presented the change of the regular meeting date from the third Monday of each month at 5: 30 p.m. to a different date and time.

On motion duly made, seconded, and carried the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That this Authority does change the regular meeting date to the second Tuesday of each month at 4:30 p.m.

Under Directors' Business, Member Smulyan requested as a regular item on the agenda an update on the project and a report on the fundraising on the project.

Under Public Comment, Chris Duderstadt thanked the Authority for attending the community meetings and sought direction as to who the public should request copies of the minutes.

There being no further business, on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Date:

**John** Rizzo
Secretary

G45
2/16/00
special
3

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

## NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING
## GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY
## WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2000
## 5:30 p.m.
## CITY HALL, ROOM 421

1. **Roll Call**

2. **Public Comment** on all matters pertaining to the closed session.

3. **Closed Session pursuant to Government Code section 54957 and San Francisco Administrative Code Section 67.10(b ).**

   **PUBLIC EMPLOYEE APPOINTMENT/HIRING:**
   **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY.**
   **Discussion of applications, interview and discussion of candidate(s), and possible action to submit candidate(s) to the Mayor for possible appointment to the position of Chief Executive Officer of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.**

4. **Reconvene in open session**

   **Vote to elect whether to disclose any or all discussions held in closed session (San Francisco Administrative Code section 67.12(a) (Action Item)**

5. **Adjournment**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 831-2099

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

## NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING
## GOLDEN GATE P ARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY
## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2000
## 4:30 P .M.
## CITY HALL, ROOM 408

1. **Roll Call**

2. **APPROV AL OF MINUTES**
   Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of January 27,2000.

3. **APPROV AL OF SECOND AND THIRD QUARTER REPORTS**
   Discussion and possible action to approve the Second and Third Quarter Reports.

4. **DISCUSSION OF DECISIONS NEEDED TO BE MADE BY THE CONCOURSE AUTHORITY IN ORDER TO BEGIN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMP ACT REPORT PROCESS**
   Discussion only of the following items required to begin preparation of environmental impact report and possible action to authorize a Concourse Authority member to work on assembling this information:

   a) A plan or diagram of the garage, indicating the number of parking spaces and showing how the garage will be accessed, both by vehicles and pedestrians.
   b) A plan or diagram showing where surface parking will be removed, and showing any related access or circulation changes within or adjacent to the park.
   c) A ballpark estimate of construction cost, and a general schedule of site investigations, design and engineering, necessary approvals, and construction.

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 831-2099

5. **PRESENTATION OF CURRENT CIRCULATION PATTERNS AND POLICIES IN CONCOURSE AREA, INCLUDING SUGGESTIONS FOR REMOVAL OF SURFACE PARKING SPACES**

   Presentation only by Deborah Learner, Recreation and Park Department's Park Planner, and discussion only of current traffic circulation patterns and policies in the Concourse area and discussion only of a plan for removal of surface parking spaces.

6. **BUDGET FY 1999-00 AND BUDGET FY 2000-01**

   Presentation and possible action to approve Budget for FY 1999-00and/or fiscal year 2000-01.

7. **FURTHER DISCUSSION OF DRAFT GENERAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES (GOALS) FOR UNDERGROUND PARKING FACILITY**

   Discussion only of draft goals for the underground parking facility in Golden Gate Parks' Music Concourse Area.

8. **DIRECTOR'S BUSINESS**

   This item allows members of the Board of Directors to raise issues they wish to address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time.

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

   At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on the agenda.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

# MINUTES OF EIGHTH MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

The special meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on February 24,2000 at 4:40 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors constituting a quorum were present: Nancy Conner, Tammy Haygood, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan, John Rizzo and Marilyn Smulyan. Member John Lum was absent.

The President called the meeting to order

President Conner announced that item number 2 and 3 were taken off calendar.

President Conner made a presentation to the Board on items that were required to begin preparation of an environmental impact report. The items she listed were: 1) a plan or diagram of the garage, indicating the number of parking spaces and showing how the garage would be accessed, both by vehicles and pedestrians, 2) a plan or diagram showing where surface parking would be removed, and showing any related access or circulation changes within or adjacent to the park and 3) a ballpark estimate of construction cost, and a general schedule of site investigations, design and engineering, necessary approvals and construction. She stated that although some of this work had already been accomplished, in order to move this forward she asked that Board Member John Lum to take the lead on developing additional options on these items with public involvement.

John Laskin reminded the Board that their job was to get the garage built as soon as possible and gave ideas to publicize meetings.

On motion duly made, seconded, and carried, the following resolution was adopted

RESOLVED, that this Board does authorize Member John Lum to start investigating into the environmental review process.

Deborah Learner, Park Planner for the Recreation and Park Department reviewed specific language in the Master Plan on land use issues in regard to and surrounding the concourse area. She explained that this was a special area plan that would come back and be adopted as part of the Master Plan at a future date. She also discussed the current traffic circulation patterns and policies in the Concourse area, the draft plan for removal of surface parking spaces and answered questions of the Board.

Lloyd Schlegal stated that he believed the voters had rejected this initiative in 1998 and that he was opposing the garage being built. John Laskin discussed the Fine Arts Museum staying in the park, and how the recreational users are getting "the short end of

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

the stick" with this. Tomsita Medal complimented Deborah Learner on her efforts and her professionalism.

Vice President Haygood presented to the Board a budget for six months of Fiscal Year 1999-00 and the entire Fiscal Year of 2000-01.

Michael Smith stated that Prop I. requires money to be put aside for specific use this first year private money is raised.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED, That this Board does approve the budget for Fiscal Year 1999-00 and Fiscal Year 2000-01

The Board discussed draft goals for the underground parking facility in Golden Gate Park's Music Concourse Area.

Michael Nurri stated that wasn't what was just in the ordinance but believed that the public voted for "a pedestrian oasis".

Under directors' business, Member Smulyan gave an update on the contract with the Duffy Company and the next steps that need to be taken including the scope of work. Once that is determined it will go on the agenda. President Conner reported that the private funders have raised in excess of $19 million. She also reported on her meeting with the Strybing Arboretum.

Under public comment, John Laksin stated that the Board should not take away the free parking spaces.

There being no further business, on motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

John Rizzo Secretary

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

45
SF
G45
#1
3/14/00
cancelled
.2

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

## NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF MEETING

**THE REGULAR MEETING OF**
**THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY**
**ON TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2000 AT 4:30 P.M.**
**IN ROOM 408, CITY HALL**

**HAS BEEN CANCELLED**

Fax Posted 3/8/00
DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAR 10 2000

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 221-8034

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

APR 11 2000

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

## NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
## TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 2000
## 4:30 PM
## CITY HALL, ROOM 408
## AGENDA

Fax 4/6/00

**ROLL CALL**

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Special Meetings of February 8, 2000 and February 24, 2000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

2. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
   (a) Introduction of Michael D. Ellzey, newly-appointed Chief Executive Officer of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority; (b) Notice of cancellation of regular meeting on May 9 and scheduling of special meeting on May 15. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

3. **WORK PLAN FOR THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE GARAGE PROJECT**
   Discussion and possible action to direct Chief Executive Officer to prepare a work plan of action necessary prior to construction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Garage. **(ACTION ITEM)**

4. **PLAN FOR PUBLIC WORKSHOP(S)**
   Discussion and possible action to direct Chief Executive Officer to prepare a plan to hold public workshop(s) about the Golden Gate Park Concourse Garage Project as soon as practicable. **(ACTION ITEM)**

5. **PRESENTATION OF THE ROCKWELL PLAN, PHASE I**
   Presentation by Friends of Recreation and Parks of the Rockwell Plan, Phase I, which proposes measures to calm traffic along John F. Kennedy Drive and to increase bicycle access. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **PRESENTATION OF DESIGN OPTIONS RELATED TO THE GARAGE**
   Presentation by Board Member John Lum of proposals for design of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Garage, with emphasis on information needed before beginning the environmental review process. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

7. **REPORT ON STATUS OF THE DUFFY COMPANY PROPOSAL TO PREPARE A TRAFFIC, TRANSITAND INFRASTRUCTURE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR GOLDEN GATE PARK**
   Discussion of the status of the Duffy Company proposal to prepare a traffic, transit and infrastructure feasibility study and implementation plan in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
   This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2085**
**Fax: (415) 221-8034**

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Commission Office at (415) 831-2750. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

**Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Public Library and on the City's website at www.ci.sf.ca.us. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact:**

**Sunshine Ordinance Task Force**
**Rachel Arnstine O'Hara, Clerk**
**City Hall, Room 362**
**1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place**
**San Francisco, CA 94102-4683**
**Office: (415) 554-6171**
**FAX: (415) 554-6177**
**Email: rachel_arnstineo'hara@ci.sf.ca.us**

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

F
A5
2
11/00

# MINUTES OF THE APRIL 11, 2000 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

The regular meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on April 11, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Rowe Conner, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan, John Rizzo and John Lum. Director Tammy Haygood was not present.

The President called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and roll call was taken.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES. A motion to approve the minutes of the Special Meetings of February 8, 2000 and February 24, 2000 was made, seconded and unanimously approved.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT. President Conner introduced Michael D. Ellzey, the newly appointed Chief Executive Officer of the Concourse Authority. Notice was then communicated that the regular meeting of the Board of Directors on May 9th would be cancelled and a special meeting has been scheduled for May 15th.

WORKPLAN FOR THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE GARAGE PROJECT. A motion was made by Director MacColl and seconded by Director O'Sullivan to direct the Chief Executive Officer to prepare a work plan of action for the construction of the Golden Gate Park underground parking facility to be located in the Music Concourse area of the Park. The motion was unanimously approved. CEO Ellzey will draft an initial work plan for discussion at the next board meeting.

WORKPLAN FOR PUBLIC WORKSHOPS. A motion was made by Director Rizzo and seconded by Director MacColl to direct the Chief Executive Officer to prepare a work plan of action to hold public workshops in support of the mission of the Concourse Authority. The motion was unanimously approved. CEO Ellzey will draft an initial work plan for public workshops, community outreach and public participation efforts preparatory to the design and construction of an underground parking facility in the Music Concourse, and the development of a comprehensive traffic, transit and parking plan for Golden Gate Park. This initial work plan will be discussed at the next board meeting.

PRESENTATION OF THE ROCKWELL PLAN, PHASE I. Donna Ernstson, executive director of Friends of Recreation and Park, made some introductory remarks regarding the evolution and development of the Rockwell "Shared Road" Plan. Calming, safer manners of travel for autos, bicyclists, and pedestrians are among the primary purposes intended to be addressed by the Rockwell Plan. The plan was developed initially by Burton Rockwell, a member of the board of directors of the Friends of

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Recreation and Park. Ms. Ernstson assured the Board that the Rockwell Plan in no way considers or contemplates any issues relating to current or possible future street closures at Golden Gate Park. It is intended to deal with improved and safer access issues for everyone using the Park, with a focus on the east end traffic dynamics.

Staff of Friends of Recreation and Park offered a presentation regarding details of the proposed Rockwell Plan. At the conclusion of the presentation, public comment was received. President Conner noted that the Rockwell Plan is a preliminary proposal regarding improved vehicular and bicycle access to and around the Park, and that the Plan represents an excellent example of a community-generated proposition for a safer Golden Gate Park. President Conner further noted that the Rockwell Plan and any other reasonable proposals received by the Concourse Authority, will be reviewed by staff within the context of the overall traffic, transit and parking plan to be developed by the Authority, and that all such proposals will be discussed at future meetings.

PRESENTATION OF DESIGN OPTIONS RELATED TO THE GARAGE. Director John Lum discussed the "two-pod scheme" proposal for a parking garage in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park that has been developed for and presented to the Concourse Authority by the Bechtel Corporation for its consideration. Director Lum reviewed a number of alternative plans and ideas that have been communicated over the past several months by members of the community. President Conner advised the attendees that ideas from the community regarding the design of the garage were encouraged, and that such comments should be communicated directly to the Concourse Authority for consideration. It was also noted that the design, location and access routes associated with the garage would be among the primary topics of discussion during the initial round of public workshops to begin this summer. Public comment ensued regarding the various alternatives and parameters presented by Director Lum.

REPORT ON THE FEASIBILITY STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR GOLDEN GATE PARK. President Conner reported that progress has been made in the discussions with the Department of Parking and Traffic on matters necessary for this study to commence. CEO Ellzey will report on the status of these discussions and this study at the next board meeting.

DIRECTORS' BUSINESS. President Conner reported that Director Smulyan has submitted a letter of resignation to the Mayor's office. The Concourse Authority has not received a copy of this letter. However, it is expected that Director Smulyan's resignation will be accepted and the process of filling this vacancy will begin as soon as practicable. President Conner indicated that nominations should be forwarded to the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority at McLaren Lodge.

PUBLIC COMMENT. There was no additional public comment.

ADJOURNMENT. The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

## NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING
## MONDAY, MAY 15, 2000
## 4:30 P.M.
## CITY HALL, ROOM 408

Fax 5/11/00
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 12 2000
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

## AGENDA

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 11, 2000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
(a) Board Vacancy – Report on the status of filling the current vacancy on the Concourse Authority's Board of Directors. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

4. **WORK PLAN FOR THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE GARAGE PROJECT**
Discussion of the plan of action necessary for the construction of the Golden Gate Concourse Garage. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **PLAN FOR PUBLIC WORKSHOPS**
Discussion of the Concourse Authority's plan to hold public workshops about the Golden Gate Park Concourse Garage project. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE DUFFEY COMPANY PROPOSAL TO PREPARE A TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORATION FEASIBILITY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR GOLDEN GATE PARK**
Discussion of the timeline and scope of the feasibility study and implementation plan to be completed in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

7. **REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE INITIAL EVALUATION OF THE MUNI G-LINE**
Discussion of the initial evaluation of possible MUNI G-line service to Golden Gate Park being undertaken under the auspices of the San Francisco Transportation Authority. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 221-8034

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

# MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2000 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A special meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on May 15, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Rowe Conner, Tammy Haygood, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan and John Lum. Director Rizzo was not present.

The President called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and roll call was taken. In addition, President Conner introduced several staff members of various organizations with whom the Concourse Authority will be working in the coming months and years. Introduced were Andrew Nash, acting executive director of the San Francisco Transportation Authority; Laura Spanjian, special assistant to Muni general manager Michael Burns; Jerry Robbins with the Department of Parking and Traffic; and David Hochschild from the Mayor's office.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES. A motion to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of April 11, 2000 was made, seconded and unanimously approved.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT. President Conner reported that no appointment has been made to fill the vacancy on the Authority's board of directors. President Conner requested that any nominations for individuals to fill this vacancy should be forwarded to staff or to the Mayor's office. Nominees should have some background in transportation issues.

(Item 7 on the Agenda was taken out of order and was discussed at this point)

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE INITIAL EVALUATION OF THE MUNI G-LINE. Mr. Andy Nash made some introductory comments and then introduced Ms. Bonnie Nelson, principal in Nelson/Nygard, a transportation consultant. Ms. Nelson indicated that Nelson/Nygard had been retained by the Transportation Authority to conduct an early evaluation of the feasibility of G-line service and other connections into Golden Gate Park. The focus would be more on feasibility and less so on funding.

Ms. Nelson reported that a draft of this study should be completed by and submitted to the Transportation Authority by the end of June. Thereafter, the report would be submitted to the Concourse Authority for its consideration, probably by the end of summer.

Mr. Nash added that the Transportation Authority is developing a countywide transportation plan, which will incorporate issues related to the G-line and other green

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

line and cultural loops and rail extension studies. Funding issues will also be considered in the countywide plan.

Ms. Spanjian from MUNI introduced herself. Ms. Spanjian indicated that MUNI and its general manager were very supportive of the efforts of the Transportation Authority and the Concourse Authority and were looking forward to working cooperatively with these agencies to create a transit system that better serves connections to Golden Gate Park.

Director Lum suggested that programmatic efforts include the simpler things, such as improved signage, noticeable logos and some possible renaming opportunities. Ms. Spanjian indicated that MUNI was aware of and generally supported the need to look into these programmatic issues.

WORKPLAN FOR THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE GARAGE PROJECT. The Chief Executive Officer reviewed an outline of a work plan and schedule for the construction of the Golden Gate Park underground parking facility to be located in the Music Concourse area of the Park. Mr. Ellzey indicated that the work plan and schedule is a continually evolving effort that is being coordinated closely with City staff the institutions, and will be the subject of extensive public outreach over the next several years.

Mary Ann Miller asked if there is a design alternative to the "two-pod scheme" for the underground parking facility. CEO Ellzey indicated that as of this point in time, the "two-pod scheme" was the only design yet submitted to the Concourse Authority. It is expected that during the summer, a design consultant will be retained for the purpose of developing other feasible design alternatives and that all feasible alternatives will be brought to the Authority board and to the public for comment and consideration.

Mr. Philip Carleton inquired as to the total budget amount for the underground parking facility. CEO Ellzey reported that the budget for the parking facility is $40 million. As provided in Proposition J, the parking facility will be constructed with private money.

Mr. Chris Duderstadt reported to the committee that he had posted an alternative design for the parking facility on his web site (SFPIX.com) and that he is involved in an individual review of the surface parking situation in the Music Concourse area. President Conner thanked Mr. Duderstadt for his efforts to make Golden Gate Park a better public space.

WORKPLAN FOR PUBLIC WORKSHOPS. The Chief Executive Officer presented a work plan of action for public workshops, community outreach and public participation efforts preparatory to the design and construction of an underground parking facility in the Music Concourse, and the development of a comprehensive traffic, transit and parking plan for Golden Gate Park.

Board member Haygood expressed concern that the public outreach process be conducted on behalf of the Concourse Authority by a firm or a series of firms or individuals that represented the diversity of the people being served by the efforts of the Concourse Authority. CEO Ellzey assured the board and the public that this very important issue will be considered in the interview and selection process for community relations assistance.

Mr. Michael Nurre inquired as to the substance of the outreach effort. CEO Ellzey indicated that the essence of the outreach would relate to design and construction issues; parking and traffic management; and surface improvements to the concourse. However, it was indicated that the specific approach to the public outreach program would be developed collaboratively with the community relations consultant.

Mr. Nurre asked whether estimates of the number of additional cars attracted to the concourse area of the Park would be available prior to the community meetings. CEO Ellzey indicated that as soon as such numbers become available to the Authority, they will be communicated publicly to the community.

Ms. Ann Lanzerotti reminded the Authority that Proposition J stipulates that no additional parked cars will be allowed in the concourse area and that for every parking space constructed in the garage, one space will be removed from the surface area.

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE DUFFEY COMPANY PROPOSAL TO PREPARE A FEASIBILITY STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR GOLDEN GATE PARK. CEO Ellzey introduced Marilyn Duffey, principal in The Duffey Company, who reported on details of the upcoming study.

Ms. Duffey indicated that she was looking forward to working with the Concourse Authority, the Transportation Authority and MUNI during the feasibility study. Ms. Duffey reviewed the four tasks that would be accomplished during the first half of the study:

1. A description of the existing transit and traffic conditions;
2. A parking inventory and a discussion of the parking to be displaced under Proposition J;
3. A review of bicycle and pedestrian circulation; and
4. Transportation demand analysis using information provided, in part, by the institutions located in the Park.

The second half of the study will focus on traffic calming measures. A report will be prepared and submitted to the Concourse Authority and will be reviewed and evaluated as a part of the Authority's public outreach commitment. Ms. Duffey assured the Board that her desire is to remain flexible in order to meet the needs of the Authority's work.

Director Haygood asked whether road closures would be included in the feasibility study. Ms. Duffey indicated that as currently designed, the study would not

specifically study traffic impacts related to road closures in the Park, particularly impacts related to closure of John F. Kennedy Drive.

Ms. Mary Ann Miller requested that analysis of other road closures, such as Conservatory Drive (East and West) be considered by the Concourse Authority, as indicated in the Golden Gate Park Master Plan.

Mr. Duderstadt would like attendance numbers from the institutions considered, including the de Young, the Tea Garden, the Academy and, particularly the Asian Art Museum, since it will be leaving the Park.

Mr. Philip Carleton asked whether the study was publicly funded. CEO indicated that the study will be publicly funded and that it is budgeted in the Authority's fiscal 2000 budget.

DIRECTORS' BUSINESS. Director Lum asked when the Board would begin discussions with staff regarding the working groups necessary for the selection of contractors and the ongoing staff level work to be accomplished on the various tasks of the Authority. President Conner indicated that she will be contacting board members to discuss formation of these working groups prior to the next board meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT. Mr. Duderstadt expressed concern that the de Young was moving ahead so quickly without apparent regard for the concerns of the Concourse Authority. CEO Ellzey assured Mr. Duderstadt and the board that, though he shared Mr. Duderstadt's concerns and such concerns had been communicated to the de Young, an extensive coordination effort is underway and should resolve issues as they arise in due course.

Director Lum reminded the Board that the Authority has no jurisdiction over the de Young project, but supported a well-managed coordinated effort.

Mr. Carleton requested that staff establish communication with SFPD regarding needed traffic calming efforts in and around the Park. CEO Ellzey agreed.

There was no further public comment.

ADJOURNMENT. The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo
Marilyn Hope Smulyan

Fax 6/9/00
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 14 2000
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

## NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
## TUESDAY, JUNE 13, 2000
## 4:30 P.M.
## CITY HALL, ROOM 408

## AGENDA

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Special Meeting of May 15, 2000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Board Vacancy – Report on the status of filling the current vacancy on the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority's Board of Directors. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

(a) Work Plan for construction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Garage – Report on the updated construction schedule and work plan for the underground parking facility. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

(b) Work Plan for community relations and public outreach – Report on the Authority's community outreach efforts in connection with its activities in Golden Gate Park. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

(c) Traffic and Transit Feasibility Study – Report on the status of the proposed contract with The Duffey Company to prepare a Traffic and Transportation Feasibility and Implementation Plan for Golden Gate Park in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**
Discussion and possible action, in accordance with Article VII, Section 1, of the bylaws of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, to elect a President, Vice President, Treasurer, Secretary and Chief Executive Officer. **(ACTION ITEM)**

6. **PRESENTATION BY THE SIERRA CLUB**
Presentation by a member of the Sierra Club of the concept of a "car free" Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 221-8034

8. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**

This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**AMENDED MINUTES OF THE JUNE 13, 2000 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION**

A regular meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on June 13, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Rowe Conner, Tammy Haygood, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan, John Lum and John Rizzo.

There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and roll call was taken. After roll was taken, the President introduced the business of the agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES. A motion to approve the minutes of the General Meeting of June 13, 2000 was made, seconded and unanimously approved.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT. President Conner reported that an appointment to fill the vacancy on the Authority's board of directors was imminent. It is expected that a new director for the Concourse Authority will be introduced at the July board meeting.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT. CEO Ellzey reported on the status of the garage construction and the public outreach work plans and the status of the contract for the traffic and transit feasibility study.

WORK PLAN FOR THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE GARAGE PROJECT. The Chief Executive Officer reviewed an updated outline of a work plan and schedule for the construction of the Golden Gate Park underground parking facility. The only change reported was the possibility of accelerating the commencement of the environmental impact report to more closely coordinate with the work being done by the institutions in the Concourse area. The projected completion date will not necessarily be affected by the slight change in the EIR schedule.

WORKPLAN FOR PUBLIC WORKSHOPS. The Chief Executive Officer presented an updated work plan of action for public workshops, community outreach and public participation efforts preparatory to the design and construction of an underground parking facility in the Music Concourse, and the development of a comprehensive traffic, transit and parking plan for Golden Gate Park. The only change in the work plan is the CEO's desire to accelerate the selection of a design consultant for the underground parking facility for the purpose of performing an evaluation of existing design options and feasible alternative design options so that as much of this information as possible can be available at the time of the initial public meetings.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE DUFFEY COMPANY PROPOSAL TO PREPARE A FEASIBILITY STUDY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR GOLDEN GATE PARK. CEO Ellzey reported that the contract with the Duffey Company for this study had been executed and that the work will begin immediately. The first phase will be a study of existing conditions and related studies currently being performed by other organizations, such as the Transportation Authority and MUNI.

Mr. Ellzey read the language from Proposition J that stipulates the goals and objectives of the feasibility study and indicated that there would be monthly reports from the Duffey Company on the status of the study beginning in July or August.

PUBLIC COMMENT. Mr. Ron Konopaski suggested that the Authority consider undertaking a broader review of traffic issues for the Golden Gate Park, in particular north and south access issues and accessibility to the Park from other parts of the City.

Mary Anne Miller suggested that particular attention be paid to the location of parking spaces to be removed as a result of the underground parking facility. Ms. Miller was advised that Recreation and Park staff has completed an initial evaluation of this matter and that Ms. Deborah Learner, Park Planner, may have some information for review. Ms. Miller also requested that the Authority consider the narrowing of roads be considered as a traffic calming measure.

Ms. Pinky Kushner reminded the Authority that the Golden Gate Master Plan provided for possible road closures in the Park but that the recently adopted Strategic Plan provided for no money for road closures. Ms. Kushner suggested that the Authority and the Recreation and Park Department pursue external funding sources to assist with planned improvements to the Park.

Mr. Phil Carleton suggested that the Authority study "grade separation" under JFK Drive at either 8th or 10th Avenues to accommodate north/south access through the Park before completing construction of the underground facility, if at all feasible. Staff agreed to study this issue as a part of the garage and traffic design process.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS. Officers for the Concourse Authority were elected for the ensuing year, as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| President - | Nancy Rowe Conner |
| Vice President and Treasurer - | Tammy Haygood |
| Secretary - | John Rizzo |
| Director - | John Lum |
| Director - | Stephanie MacColl |
| Director - | Margaret O'Sullivan |
| Chief Executive Officer - | Michael D. Ellzey |

PRESENTATION BY THE SIERRA CLUB. Mr. Howard Strassner, Chair of the Transportation Committee of the local chapter of the Sierra Club and Mr. Jim Hulian, a

member of the local Sierra Club chapter and the Transportation Committee presented the concept of a "car free" Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

Mr. Strassner provided a general overview of the Sierra Club's concept and how it relates to the general efforts of the Authority under the terms of Proposition J. Mr. Strassner stressed that achieving the "pedestrian oasis" contemplated by the Proposition is an important objective of the Sierra Club. Mr. Hulian focused his remarks on the various technical and access issues presented by the Sierra Club "car free" concourse plan.

(NOTE: A copy of a letter summarizing the Sierra Club plan and an aerial view of the Concourse area with a design overlay of the Sierra Club plan were distributed at the meeting and copies are available from the Concourse Authority upon request.)

President Conner thanked the Sierra Club for its presentation and indicated that the Concourse Authority would include the Sierra Club plan in its evaluation of design alternatives for the construction of the underground parking facility and the attendant traffic, transit and parking studies.

CEO Ellzey stated that a key role of the Concourse Authority is to take a leadership role in the coordination of the design and construction efforts of the organizations and institutions in the Concourse area. Ultimately, the design of both the de Young Museum and the California Academy of Sciences would have to carefully consider the Sierra Club plan. Of particular importance will be concourse area improvements that adequately accommodate the elderly and disabled.

PUBLIC COMMENT. Mr. Konopaski expressed concerns of the Sierra Club's interpretation of the language of Proposition J and suggested that any inconsistencies be studied carefully. Mr. Konopaski reiterated concerns of the Plan's impacts on accessibility of the elderly and disabled to the music concourse area. Finally, Mr. Konopaski expressed a concern that traffic calming efforts may in fact cause greater problems than "facilitating" faster traffic flow through the concourse area.

Mr. Chris Duderstadt stated that any removal 10th Avenue north/south access through the Park would leave a north/south access void between Arguello and 25th Avenue, which in his opinion should be carefully evaluated.

Ms. Tomasita Medal spoke to the concerns of a negative impact of a "car free" concourse on the ability of the elderly and disabled to enjoy both automobile and MUNI surface access to the institutions. She also discussed the safety issues potentially occasioned by a pedestrian-only concourse.

Ms. Patty Lacson expressed to the Board the importance of keeping Tea Garden Drive open. Such access is perceived to be very important to the ongoing success of the de Young Museum. In addition, it is important to the institution to keep a MUNI stop in front of Museum.

Ms. Carolyn Blair expressed support for the Sierra Plan, suggesting that it would result in safer and healthier concourse environment.

A member of the community remembered Louise Baptista, a scientist at the California Academy of Sciences, who passed away recently, for his contributions to science in the area.

DIRECTOR'S BUSINESS. President Conner directed the CEO to develop and present to the next Concourse Authority board meeting a recommended program for the Authority's ability to pursue and enter into contracts for the design and construction of the underground parking facility and its other projects. CEO Ellzey would begin work on such a program for presentation at the next board meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT. Mr. Phil Carleton, who supports the Sierra Club plan, suggested the increased funds raised by the institutions could more than adequately mitigate the concerns of the elderly and disabled.

Mr. Duderstadt notified the Board that beginning last week the "No Parking between 6-9" on MLK were being enforced and, as a result, parkers have begun parking elsewhere. The Authority should be aware.

Mr. Duderstadt inquired as to whether the Concourse Authority has taken a position regarding the Saturday Closure initiative. President Conner stated that the Authority had not yet taken a formal position. CEO Ellzey indicated that he would be speaking to the Neighborhood Parks Council later in the week and would represent the staff's perspective on the proposed initiative. The Alliance for Golden Gate Park is now gathering signatures necessary to qualify this initiative to appear on the November ballot. CEO Ellzey indicated that he would be asking the Board to consider weighing in on this issue sometime over the next several months.

Finally, Mr. Duderstadt repeated that he hasn't heard enough of the word "Park" in our discussions.

Ms. Jane Nurse indicated some concerns regarding the source of funds for the Authority's work. Proposition J seems to indicate that no public funds were to be used on these projects. Ms. Nurse requested information in this regard. CEO Ellzey explained the limitations of Proposition J and the general relationship between the public and private components of the work to be done under Proposition J. The budget of the Concourse Authority is being considered as a part of the City budgeting process and will be reviewed at a future meeting.

There was no further public comment.

ADJOURNMENT. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

Fax 7/7/00

## NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
## TUESDAY, JULY 11, 2000
## 4:30 P.M.
## CITY HALL, ROOM 408

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 11 2000
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

## AGENDA

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 13, 2000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
Board Member Appointment – Introduction of Mr. James L. Lazarus, newly appointed Board Member for the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**
Traffic and Transit Feasibility Study – Report on the status of the contract with The Duffey Company to prepare a Traffic and Transportation Feasibility and Implementation Plan for Golden Gate Park in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **CONTRACTING POLICY FOR THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY**
Discussion and possible action to approve a policy recommended by the Chief Executive Officer, which the Authority will pursue and negotiate contracts with consultants and contractors in accordance with the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act. **(ACTION ITEM)**

6. **PRESENTATION BY THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL RAILWAY**
Presentation by a member of the staff of the San Francisco Municipal Railway on the organization, background, purpose, goals and objectives of MUNI. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

7. **PRESENTATION BY THE SAN FRANCISCO BICYCLE COALITION**
Presentation by a member of the staff of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition on the background, purpose, goals and objectives of the Coalition. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 221-8034

8. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

# MINUTES OF THE JULY 11, 2000 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIL PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on July 11, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Rowe Conner, Tammy Haygood, James Lazarus, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan and John Rizzo.

The President called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. and roll call was taken.

(Item 5 on the Agenda was taken out if order as a discussion only item and was discussed at this point.)

CONTRACTING POLICY FOR THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY. CEO Ellzey made some introductory comments and then introduced Ms. Veronica Ng, Senior Contract Compliance Officer for the Human Rights Commission. Ms. Ng gave a brief summary of the roll of HRC in city contracting. The HRC ensures that there is non-discrimination in employment as well as to promote minority, women, and locally owned businesses in city contracts. Ms. Ng elaborated on ordinances 12B and 12D. She explained that the 12D ordinance requires equal opportunity for participation among minority, women, and locally owned businesses in city contracts. 12B involves two things—nondiscrimination in employment, and equal benefits, including domestic partners.

Ms. Ng described the participation goals in this project. It could be a difference of only a few percent to as high as 20-30% depending on the scope of work and percentage of availability. She encouraged the use of the HRC directory.

James Lazarus then brought up Prop. J and asked Ms. Ng if she had had the chance to review it. He reminded her that the contracting provisions were not applicable except for 12B & D. Ms. Ng referred the question to the City Attorney for later discussion.

Mr. Lazarus requested some elaboration regarding lee time. Ms. Ng responded that it would depend on the type of license required and whether there would be sub-contractors. In order to speed up the lee time it is a good idea to begin working with a project manager immediately so that the language and requirements would be in sync.

Mr. Lazarus mentioned the Vallejo Street garage and asked is Ms. Ng knew of its progress. Ms. Ng informed the quorum that ground breaking has begun and the NTP is completed. She remarked that her department has already completed the process with Parking and Traffic.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Mr. Lazarus suggested that it would be helpful for her to describe the planning process between the Vallejo Street garage project and Parking and Traffic in the development of working with minority, women and locally owned businesses. Ms. Ng replied that setting up the goal is a short process.

Mr. Lazarus inquired as to the possibility of getting a history from the last fifteen or twenty years of similar projects including the goals of such businesses. Ms. Ng answered that in the past there was no 12B requirement as it is only three years old. She said that she would see how far back she could go.

***Someone*** asked as to the standardization of the goals of the HRC. Ms. Ng responded that the goals were *not* standardized and the goal was based on the scope of the work. The project manager and engineer will determine the breakdown depending on the scope of the project.

CEO Ellzey then introduced Mr. Randy Parent, Deputy City Attorney, City and County of San Francisco. Mr. Parent gave a brief description of the role of the City Attorney's Office during the construction process. And, although the Concourse Authority has been exempted from many of the requirements, he went on to describe the usual requirements and what it means to have had these waived.

Mr. Parent answered a previous question in reference to Prop J. He reiterated that Prop J maintains that the project is not to be considered a public works project and is, therefore, not subject to any of the requirements of a public works project. However, the Concourse Authority is still required to comply with 12B and 12D so long as the order is put out to bid. Also, the subcontractor goals would apply regardless of the selection process.

***Someone*** asked how much longer the process would be if we were to go with an RFP. Mr. Parent responded that it would depend on how efficient we were during the process. It may take up to four months. He mentioned that 12D has lengthened the whole process by requiring a preference to minority/woman own firms.

***Someone*** then asked how the process of choosing a professional contractor would affect the board's liability. Mr. Parent suggested that the liability would be relatively low as the voters have exempted us from the whole process.

CEO Ellzey then introduced Mr. Christopher M. Iglesias, Contract Compliance Manager, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Iglesias reported on his agency's community outreach efforts on construction projects and how it gets MBE and WBE participation on public/private partnerships. He commended the Concourse Authority for being so far ahead in working with local/minority firms. He described the goals of the agency for this type of project and remarked that the main goal is that the project has a workforce that reflects the City and County of San Francisco. He suggested that, in a project of this size, the use of a staff person would be helpful for monitoring contracts.

CEO Ellzey introduced Ingrid Merriwhether, CIC from Merriwhether & Williams. Ms. Merriwhether addressed the concerns of her firm which assists hundreds of small, minority and woman owned businesses in eliminating the barriers to public contracting opportunities. She emphasized that the main obstacle is setting up the process thereby helping to eliminate the barriers before we even get started. A brief synopsis was given of the barriers that such businesses have when pursuing public contracting opportunities. The primary solutions to those barriers are the lack of compliance with the goals of the HRC. Additionally, a prompt payment plan is key to the success of the smaller firms. Finally, Ms. Merriwhether invited the Concourse Authority to use her firm as a resource for contractors.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES. A motion to amend the minutes of the Meeting of June 13, 2000 was made, seconded, and approved.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT. President Connor introduced Mr. James Lazarus, newly appointed Board Member for the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. Mr. Lazarus acknowledged the introduction.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT. CEO Ellzey reported on the status on the Department of Traffic and Transit Feasibility and Implementation Plan. Assurance has been received that the Wilber Smith and the Duffy Company contract has been signed. There have been some staff meetings and tasks have been outlined. There will be a presentation by Marilyn Duffy at the August Board Meeting.

Director Rizzo suggested that the transportation study consider the impact of special events and the traffic that they generate. CEO Ellzey responded that the study would include event management.

Mr. John Barbey, Vice President of Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association and member of the CSFN Transportation Committee, expressed his horror at the prospect of a light rail through Golden Gate Park.

Ms. Pinky Kushner remarked on Director Rizzo's point regarding special events. She suggested the possibility of including the UCSF Parking Garage into the study.

PRESENTATION BY THE SAN FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL RAILWAY. Laura Stanjian, Special Assistant to the General Manager of the San Francisco Municipal Railway reported on the organization, background, purpose, goals, the objectives of MUNI, and future plans for improvement. She reported on the short and long-term goals of service to Golden Gate Park. There will be signage change on the 44 O'Shaughnessy to O'Shaughnessy/Golden Gate Park. There will be an intensive review of all the lines in an effort to make the time schedules more realistic. There has been priority given to the lines in the Sunset and the Richmond Districts, which affect to Park. This should be done within the next year. Ms. Stanjian encouraged increased marketing for service to Golden Gate Park. Among the longer-term goals are the G-line and the historic trolleys in the

Park. Shuttle service has been suggested in and around the park that will connect with MUNI. Weekend service is also up for improvement.

***One of the Directors*** asked Ms. Stanjian about the nature of the relationship between MUNI and the Concourse Authority in working with shuttle service into and out of Golden Gate Park. Ms. Stanjian responded that MUNI would be working closely with the Concourse Authority to get those shuttles and if they are successful there has been mention that MUNI will take over that service. Ms. Stanjian also made comment that the institutions within the park are also supportive of a close working relationship with MUNI and their services for the Park.

Pinky Kushner again promoted the usage of the UCSF garage. She suggested a reduced fare on MUNI while travelling the nine blocks on the bus from the garage. Ms. Stanjian responded that the idea would be looked into.

Richard Lanzerotti encouraged the use of compressed natural gas or hybrid fuel for MUNI's rolling stock.

John Barbey asked if there was a consideration of a less intrusive alternative to the placement of a light rail system into the Park such as a people mover, an elephant train, or the aforementioned shuttles. CEO Ellzey responded that the Concourse Authority would be looking at all of these options.

PRESENTATION BY THE SAN FRANCISCO BICYCLE COALITION. David Snyder, Executive Director if the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition reported on the background, purpose, goals and objectives of the Coalition. He addressed the issue of the Saturday closure and, although the coalition has very strong feelings about the closure, he stated that it is not an initiative of the SFBC. Mr. Snyder invited the quorum to speak with him about the issue off record. Regarding specific issues that relate to Golden Gate Park, Mr. Snyder finds the conditions on Martin Luther King and John F. Kennedy unacceptable. He encouraged the cooperation of the Authority to make the Park a safe transportation corridor for bicyclists.

PUBLIC COMMENT. Mr. Duderstadt mentioned a couple of dot com pages that may be of interest— www.sfpix.com/park/issues/dyg/ggpconcourse.html and www.sfpix.com/sierra_club/.

There was no further public comment.

ADJOURNMENT. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

Fax 8/4/00
DOCUMENTS DEPT.

AUG - 7 2000

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**TUESDAY, August 8, 2000**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 11, 2000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

   Ballot Initiative to Close Certain Roads in Golden Gate Park on Saturdays – Brief discussion of the recent certification of an initiative to be included in the November 2000 ballot to close certain roads in Golden Gate Park on Saturdays, beginning on January 1, 2001. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

   Announcement of the Hiring of Executive Assistant – Chief Executive Officer will announce that Ms. Julia Kay has accepted an offer of employment to serve as the Executive Assistant to the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.

   Cooperative Working Relationship with Department of Environment – Brief discussion of cooperative programs being contemplated between the Concourse Authority and the Department of Environment for the study of an environmentally friendly series of projects in the Music Concourse area. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

   Traffic and Transit Feasibility Study – Marilyn Duffey will report on the status of the Authority's contract under which the Duffey Company is preparing a Traffic and Transportation Feasibility and Implementation Plan for Golden Gate Park, in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **PRESENTATION ON EXTENDING THE MUNI G-LINE TO GOLDEN GATE PARK.** The San Francisco County Transportation Authority and its consultant, Nelson/Nygaard, will present the results of the recently completed feasibility study on extending the San Francisco Municipal Railway G-line service to Golden Gate Park. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **CONTRACTING POLICY FOR THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY**
   Discussion and possible action to approve a policy, recommended by the Chief Executive Officer, by which the Authority will pursue and negotiate contracts with consultants and contractors in accordance with the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. **(ACTION ITEM)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2085
Fax: (415) 221-8034

7. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**

This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

# MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 8, 2000 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the board of directors of The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on August 8, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Rowe Connor, James Lazarus, John Lum, and John Rizzo. Tammy Haygood, Stephanie MacColl, and Margaret O'Sullivan were not present.

There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. and roll call was taken.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES.** A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of July 11, 2000 was made, seconded, and approved.

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT.** President Connor presented a brief discussion of the recent certification of an initiative to be included in the November 2000 ballot to close certain roads in Golden Gate Park on Saturdays, beginning on January 1, 2001.

CEO Ellzey stated that he would be interested to hear from the City Attorney's Office regarding election-time activities generally, what the Board's authority and staff's limitations may be, and whether it may take a position on this or any measure or candidate.

President Connor stated that the Duffey Company is spearheading a review of the possible impacts of Saturday closure in relation to the feasibility work it is doing. She then requested that the CEO Ellzey investigate how the closure would effect the work that we are doing.

David Miles, representative for the Advocates for a Safe Golden Gate Park, the organization which put forth the initiative to close the park's traffic on Saturday, spoke to the Board. Mr. Miles reminded the Authority of the efforts toward Saturday closure and the merits of such a closure.

Carolyn Blair discussed the Recreation and Open Space Master Plan and referred to page 1.3.21. She highlighted its intent to minimize vehicular traffic. She recommended to the Authority that the closure be extended to Saturday and that we promote more recreational activities.

Katherine Roberts, Board Member of the Haight/Ashbury Neighborhood Council, reminded the Authority that the Council has come out in favor of the Saturday Closure. She warned the Authority that it would 'look bad' if it were to come out against the measure.

Dr. Ronald Konopaski, representing the Richmond District, encouraged that the park be made available to all the citizens of San Francisco and not be limited to one special group. He maintains that the elderly and handicapped who wish to enjoy the park need vehicular access to the concourse. He came out against Saturday closure, in favor of weekend access for the handicapped and elderly patrons of the park.

Michael Smith recounted some of the history of the Saturday closure proposition. He argued that the Saturday closure will happen and that opposition is futile. He rebutted Dr. Konopaski's statement and remarked that the Saturday closure is for everyone.

Director John Lum reminded everyone that the Authority is not establishing public policy in regards to the Saturday closure and that we do not have a role in approving or disapproving the policy. He asked the City Attorney for their opinion.

Mariam Morley from the City Attorney's Office stated that this issue is a matter being placed before the voters and that the Authority will not be permitted to take a position either way. The only discussion open to the Authority is to study the effects of Saturday closure, should the measure pass.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT.** CEO Ellzey commended the Alliance for a Safe Golden Gate Park on their efforts to qualify their initiative for the ballot.

He then informed the Authority that Ms. Julia Kay has accepted the offer for employment and will serve as the Executive Assistant to the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.

CEO Ellzey then reported that he and Director Rizzo had met with the Department of the Environment and have developed a cooperative relationship with that Department. He then asked Director Rizzo to elaborate on opportunities for a "green garage."

Director Rizzo reported that they had discussed the Department of Environment's various programs in the promotion of 'green buildings' that use low energy, safe, and recycled materials and how these programs could be used in the construction of a garage. The Department will be doing some research for the Authority to determine whether any of its parking facility's work may be considered 'green.' They have scheduled another meeting in two weeks to discuss their findings. The Academy of Sciences has expressed interest in being a part of the Department of Environment's Green Building Program. CEO Ellzey added that we are also going to be applying for consideration in being a part of a pilot program within the City and County of San Francisco for a 'green' garage.

CEO Ellzey then introduced Marilyn Duffey from the Duffey Company, for discussion of the status of the Authority's contract under which the Duffey Company is preparing a Traffic and Transportation Feasibility and Implementation Plan for Golden Gate Park, in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998.

Ms. Duffey reported on the status of her efforts to date. She summarized the following points in brief:

- the study of the Muni G Line;
- the Golden Gate Park de Young Museum environmental report;
- the work that is planned for the Academy of Sciences;
- and the environmental impact statement.

She then invited the bicycle coalition to help with her study regarding statistics on bicycle usage in Golden Gate Park.

Ms. Duffey reported on her meetings with SPUR, Presidio Trust, the Transportation Authority, and the concept of the visitor shuttle service (cultural shuttle). This shuttle would link various cultural attractions within the city. There are plans to conduct further meetings with staff regarding the cultural shuttle.

Ms. Duffey addressed the Saturday closure issue and reminded everyone that the company is not assigned to study in depth the traffic and parking impact of closing JFK. She referred inquiries regarding this issue to the final transportation study and the final Golden Gate Park Master Plan Environmental Impact Report done by the Duffey Company. Ms. Duffey then introduced Tim Ernie to explain parking inventory.

Mr. Tim Ernie from Wilbur Smith Associates reported that there have been no new counts done and that this study is based on counts done previously on such studies as the new de Young and the GGP Master Plan. Taking into account those previous studies, congestion in popular attraction areas, competition with pay-to-park garage spaces, the proposed shuttle, and new bike lanes; he estimates that 850 parking places can be removed in compliance with Proposition J and not detrimentally effect the traffic in the area.

Katherine Roberts asked if there was any progress toward the limitation of parking so that the park would not be used as a commuter parking lot.

President Connor replied that information to that effect was in the master plan.

Dan McKenna from the Recreation and Park Department added that the master plan provides for restricted parking along MLK and portions of Middle Drive. There is funding in place this year and there will be three-hour and four-hour restrictions for those sections. This should reduce the commuter parking opportunities.

Dr. Konopasky expressed his dismay in that we are seeking to eliminate over 800 parking places. It is his opinion that there is already a parking crisis in and around the area of the park.

There was also concern that the employees were using many of the parking spaces.

**PRESENTATION ON EXTENDING THE MUNI G-LINE TO GOLDEN GATE PARK.** Andy Nash, Acting Executive Director, San Francisco County Transportation Authority and its consultant Bonnie Nelson from Nelson/Nygaard, reported on the results of the recently completed feasibility study on extending the San Francisco Municipal Railway G-line service to Golden Gate Park. The feasibility study was made available to the commission and audience and was discussed.

Director Rizzo felt that the estimate of visitors was a conservative one, as it doesn't include various festivals and races that take place frequently in Golden Gate Park.

Dan McKenna from RecPark added that the annual attendance from the Japanese Tea Garden, which did not appear on the study, was 650,000.

Director Lazarus asked about revenue. Ms. Nelson responded that revenue was not calculated in the study. The study includes only operating costs and does not represent a net operating profits picture.

President Connor asked what the next steps are toward implementation. Mr. Nash reported that since MUNI is already short-funded, the construction of the G-line would represent an additional capital expense. Funding would have to be established both for the line and for any other studies.

Mr. Konoplasky commented that the proposed G-line would only serve to add to the congestion on 9th Avenue. He feels that the routing for the G-line needs reconsideration.

Art Michel, President of Market Street Railway and Board Member of Inner Sunset Park Neighbors, stated that the Academy agreed to underwrite part of a study that would follow up on the Transportation Authority's feasibility study. He believes that the proportion of revenue would be high as a majority of the riders are not fastpass users. He commended Nelson/Nygaard on their study, however, he disagreed with their conclusions regarding the negative feedback from the 9th Avenue merchants. He stated that the Inner Sunset Park Neighbors had done their own survey in which the outcome was more favorable. He felt the cost feasibility was odd, because his own survey conveyed something different. On the whole, Mr. Michel believes the G-line would be a success.

Katherine Roberts also complimented Nelson/Nygaard on the their report. Ms. Roberts encouraged the implementation of the G-line. She thinks that the line would relieve congestion of the N-line, but she discouraged the extension of the line to Haight and Stanyan.

Michael Smith pointed out that PacBell Park has fewer parking spaces than Golden Gate Park, because of better transit. He encouraged that the same type of transit to the Park be implemented. He believes that in order to help further this project, there should be increased activism and the Concourse Authority should push City Hall to affect a solution. He stated that the concerns of the merchants on 9th Avenue are unfounded as it is not necessary to lose any parking places on that street, and the G-line would bring even more people to the area.

Tom Harriman addressed the issues concerning the G-line and the disabled. He stated that only small percentages of the disabled population own and operate their own vehicles. He pointed out that as the population ages there will be an increased number of people who will need their transportation needs addressed.

Tomasita Medál added that before any expensive plans are implemented we do our best to use the existing resources such as increased usage of the 44 line. She also pointed to an article in the *Richmond Review* that reports that the Alliance is attempting to derail the implementation of Proposition J. She then passed out copies of the article to the commission.

Chris Duderstadt addressed that historically there has been extreme resistance to trolleys in the park, and gave a brief historical rundown.

CONTRACTING POLICY FOR THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY. CEO Ellzey discussed an action to approve a policy by which the Authority will pursue and negotiate contracts with consultants and contractors in accordance with the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. CEO Ellzey reviewed a number of relevant sections of the Act as these provisions pertained to the Concourse area projects and the contracting practices of the Authority. CEO Ellzey then reviewed the Policy in detail (copy attached) for the Board. He assured the Board that best efforts were expended to develop and achieve a fair and equitable balance between the mandate of the Act for expedient completion of the project and the desire of the Authority to implement a fair and open contracting process.

To that end, the recommended policy was developed in coordination with the Human Rights Commission, the City Attorney's office, the Office of the City Architect and a number of city departments. In essence, the policy provides that the Authority will select a "staff" of five key prime consultants, without a competitive process, to assist and advise the CEO in the administration of the project. These five areas are design/architecture; environmental; project management; community relations; and construction management/general contractor. Under the direction of the CEO, these five consultants - working closely with the Human Rights Commission – would manage a subcontracting process designed to establish and achieve goals for MBE/WBE participation, based on the number of subcontractors one would expect to participate in the absence of discrimination.

CEO Ellzey recommended approval of the Policy.

Director Rizzo asked that the meanings to the abbreviations MBE and WBE be spelled out.

Public commentary from the concourse institutions that were present at the meeting was requested.

Deborah Friedman from the Fine Arts Museums stated that, although they support the project, the Museum didn't have any opinion as to the Authority's organization.

Ed Tong from Asian, Inc. commented on the contracting policy. He asks that the Concourse Authority defer taking an action, as it had not become a public document. He encouraged the Authority to follow the process from the beginning.

CEO Ellzey stated that any delay in the process would be detrimental to the interests of the project and the City and would cause an additional three of four-month delay. He assured the Board that the policy was carefully developed in coordination with the Human Rights Commission and that the policy represents a favorable balance in implementation of a fair and open process.

Jim Lazarus reminded everyone present that it is the goal of the Authority to meet similar MBE and WBE goals as if this were a city project. He encouraged the board to go with this proposal that was developed by the HRC, the City Attorney, and our staff. Director Lazarus then moved to approve the policy.

The motion was seconded by Director Rizzo, and approved unanimously.

**DIRECTORS' BUSINESS.** President Connor asked the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should discuss at future meetings. There were none.

**PUBLIC COMMENT.** President Connor then invited the public to address the commission.

Jane Nurre asked the committee to remind all those who we work with to use two sided paper. She also wants an answer in writing as to where the funds for the project are coming from.

Tomasita Medál asked that there be coordination among consultants when conducting future surveys and studies.

Dr. Lanzerotti asked if we had had any comment from tour/school bus people.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:45.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT

SEP 12 2000

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**TUESDAY, September 12, 2000**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 8, 2000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

   Introduction of New Executive Assistant – The President will introduce Ms. Julia Kay, recently hired Executive Assistant for the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

   Employee Recognition – The President will recognize the contributions of Ms. Linda Griffin, Executive Secretary in the Recreation and Park Department, for her services for the one-year period ending August 2000, as executive assistant and Acting Commission Secretary for the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

   Traffic and Transit Feasibility Study – Marilyn Duffey will report on the status of the Authority's contract under which the Duffey Company is preparing a Traffic and Transportation Feasibility and Implementation Plan for Golden Gate Park, in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **INTRODUCTION OF PROJECT CONSULTANTS.** The Chief Executive Officer will introduce MCK Associates (Project Manager); Gordon Chong & Partners (Master Architect); EIP (Environmental Review) and Public Affairs Management (Community Relations) as four of the prime consultants identified by staff to provide technical assistance on the Concourse area project and with whom negotiations are currently underway. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**

   This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2085**
**Fax: (415) 221-8034**

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

**DISABILITY ACCESS**

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

**KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE**

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

**WRITTEN COMMENTS**

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

F
15
2/00

**MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 12, 2000 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION**

A regular meeting of the directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on September 12, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Rowe Connor, Tammy Haygood, James Lazarus, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan, and John Rizzo.

There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:38 p.m. and roll was taken.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**. A motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of August 8, 2000 was made, seconded, and approved.

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT**. President Connor made a brief introduction of Ms. Julia Kay, recently hired Executive Assistant for the Golden Gate Concourse Authority.

President Connor then recognized the contributions of Ms. Linda Griffin, Executive Secretary in the Recreation and Park Department, for her services for a one-year period ending August 2000, as Executive Assistant and Acting Commission Secretary for the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. CEO Ellzey then presented Ms. Griffin with an award for her tireless service.

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**. CEO Ellzey reported on the Transportation Action Plan compiled for the implementation of traffic, transit, and infrastructure plans, programs, policies, goals, and improvements related to the Concourse Area of the park. Wilbur Smith Associates and the Duffey Company have been contracted by the Authority to help develop concept options for the shuttle system as part of this plan as put forth by Proposition J. He reminded everyone present that this is a feasibility study in development and not an announcement of any program. CEO Ellzey stated that the staff is working on gathering together a small working group that has a stake in the implementation of the shuttle. That group should be in place by the next board meeting and we should have more information then.

President Connor asked the CEO where funding for the Shuttle project will come from. CEO Ellzey responded that those funds would likely be coming to us from a combination of public and private funds.

Director Rizzo suggested that Lincoln Park might be considered part of the route to include the Legion of Honor Fine Arts Museum. CEO Ellzey stated that all possibilities would be discussed at upcoming meetings.

Director Lum asked that we consider the shuttle from a citywide perspective. CEO Ellzey answered that our interpretation of Proposition J, thus far, is limited to intrapark and cultural shuttles, with connections to the citywide transit system.

CEO Ellzey then introduced Tim Ernie from Wilbur Smith Associates to expand on the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Ernie reported that Wilbur Smith and Associates is currently working on two things—bicycles and parking. For bicycles, Michael Smith of the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition has requested a potential sharing of resources to collect data regarding bicycles in the Park. In terms of parking, Wilbur Smith continues to work on collecting data for the removal of parking spaces and comparing that information with Deborah Learner studies from RecPark. She has already identified certain streets that could have parking removed entirely. Also, they will receive information from DPW regarding the planned changes to landscaping in the park, which will eliminate some parking spaces in the park. Together, these will serve toward completion of a final list of potential parking spaces that could be removed in conjunction with Proposition J.

President Connor asked if their assessment is for spaces throughout the park or only in the Concourse Area. Mr. Ernie responded that the spaces are throughout the park. He had been asked to provide recommendations in removing parking spaces that would make the park safer. Specifically, additional spaces could be removed in addition to those that will be removed in anticipation of the garage construction.



DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 0 8 2001
SAN FRANCISCO

CEO Ellzey said that this Transportation Action plan would be complete by the end of the year and issued at the January meeting. The following months will focus on interpretation, recommendations, and advances toward candidate programs for implementation.

**INTRODUCTION OF PROJECT CONSULTANTS.** The Chief Executive Officer introduced project consultants. These are the four of the prime consultants identified by staff thus far to provide technical assistance on the Concourse Area Project and with whom discussions are currently underway. He first introduced Mr. Brendan McDevitt, President of MCK Associates.

Mr. McDevitt announced that MCK is proposing to provide project management services for the Proposition J project. He compares the proposed role of MCK to that of the Pac Bell Park project, which he just completed. Upon completion, all parties involved met with satisfaction regarding the contract. He proposed that a similar role was needed on the Proposition J project. Mr. McDevitt then introduced one of his colleagues, Mr. Klung. Mr. Klung will be a member of the Proposition J team and was the Project Superintendent for the Pac Bell project. Mr. McDevitt is in possession of a general contracting license and has a mechanical engineering license in the State of California. Mr. McDevitt's other experience includes construction manager for the City of San Francisco for six years and as acting engineer on a major City project in the Sea Cliff area in 1995.

Director Haygood requested that Mr. McDevitt provide resumes of those who will be working with him on the project and Mr. Ellzey replied that those would be made available to the Commission for review.

There was some discussion regarding the pricing structure regarding subcontractors. The CEO stated that the terms for all agreements are still under discussion and that parameters for agreements would be available for review and approval by the Board when they are finalized.

Director Lum asked about coordination efforts with other projects in the Concourse area. CEO Ellzey responded that each project already has a team or an individual in place and Mr. McDevitt would be our representative on technical matters regarding the project and coordination with others. Mr. McDevitt has met with them in an effort to understand an appropriate scope of service. There will be joint schedules that include all projects so that each team manager will be able to coordinate the projects. CEO Ellzey added that the City Architect is currently handling those schedules and that the objective is to complete all the projects at generally the same time in early 2005.

CEO Ellzey then introduced Gordon Chong from Gordon Chong and Associates.

Mr. Chong gave a brief overview of his company as he passed around photo-presentation boards of his work. His company has worked on many projects that are community-based. He maintains that the design process is interactive with regard to its neighbors and contains a social responsibility. His company has worked specifically with the City as a consultant in various departments which include Recreation and Park, Port of San Francisco, the airport, MUNI, San Francisco General, and Laguna Honda. The samples that he passed around exhibit past projects similar to the requirements of Proportion J in terms of underground parking facilities, parking in general, master planning, and urban design. He also insists on a transit first approach to planning.

There was some discussion regarding the pricing structure for the project. Mr. Chong responded that his concern is to minimize costs and work prudently and judiciously while designing within the scope of Proposition J, which allows for the beautification of the above ground Concourse area, and a transit first development approach. In response to Director Rizzo, Mr. Chong reported his company designs building that are sustainable from an ecological standpoint, as well as being economically viable.

Director Lazarus wanted to know more about the functionality of parking garages and how that is determined in the design process. Mr. Chong responded that there are a lot of things that will determine the workability of the garage—the types of cars, frequency of usage, peak periods, etc. Mr. Chong's firm already has some understanding of those issues.

CEO Ellzey next introduced Kay Wilson from Public Affairs Management, a woman-owned firm based in San Francisco.

Ms. Wilson reported that PAM has been an established company for thirteen years. Other recent projects include Golden Gate Park Master Plan with Recreation and Park, the Doyle Drive Replacement Project which requires close coordination with the Presidio Trust and the National Parks Service, San Francisco Management Program, MUNI Metro Turn-around Project, Moscone Center Feasibility Study, and the Ferry Building Renovation. Ms. Wilson knows that there is a lot to be accomplished on this project and looks forward to working with the community. She realizes that we are considering a broad range and wants to get the neighborhood involved in key issues, as well as a wider group with regional interest. Her firm will conduct neighborhood workshops and meetings to get the word out to the community, encourage input, and help respond to issues as we move along. The firm will be teamed up with MIG and is working with CEO Ellzey to define the scope, the design, and environmental review process. PAM will also work in coordination with other Concourse Area projects.

Ms. Wilson spoke about her firm's partnership with MIG. She spoke for Dan Iacofano who wasn't able to attend. Mr. Iacofano will play a lead role in the meeting facilitation and meeting design and process. There will be an ongoing educational program to keep the public informed of the progress of the project. MIG will be responsible for managing the process, assisting with meetings, and communication materials such as newsletters and WebPages.

Director Rizzo wanted some clarification on neighborhood workshops, as our project is more widespread than the just surrounding neighborhoods. Ms. Wilson assured the Commission that our outreach would be widespread, both citywide and regional.

Director Haygood was concerned about exploring all opportunities to invite every sector of the community, especially those that do not normally participate in such discussions. She wanted some explanation as to the process that PAM would use in order to get them involved.

Ms. Wilson responded that this is an important concern and that PAM will work to make this happen. She cited examples such as, churches, business groups, and fliers. She explained that every area is unique and PAM will do what works best for that area, keep the Commission informed of the progress of the community outreach program and keep an ongoing dialogue with the Authority.

As far as a time-line, CEO Ellzey pointed out that there is no reason to go out in advance. The programmatic portion of the project will start some time next year. However, PAM would like to develop some general informational material so people know that we have begun and that technical studies are in progress. It is important to start the communication process as soon as possible.

CEO Ellzey introduced the last of the four prime consultants that will present at this meeting, Mr. Michael Rice from EIP. Mr. Rice currently serves as the environmental contractor on the DeYoung and the Academy projects.

Mr. Rice reported that EIP and predecessor have been in San Francisco for over 30 years. In addition to Golden Gate Park projects, they have done EIRs for Pac Bell Park and have performed them under strict time constraints. EIP also did the EIR for Mission Bay. Mr. Rice went on to describe the process of carrying out an EIR. The main requirement of an EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act is public disclosure and review of the physical environmental effects of a project. It's a gathering of information to aid the decision making process. Completing an EIR does not approve a project but it is a prerequisite to approval. It is important to also look at any alternative possibilities should any arise in order to answer to those possibilities.

When questioned about any past difficulties regarding an EIR process, Mr. Rice stated that he had been involved in an unsuccessful legal action in which one of his client's was being questioned about the quality of an EIR. The case was thrown out in the end. Other than that, Mr. Rice has personally managed EIRs in the San Francisco since the early 80s. He was project manager for several firms and never was subject to any successful legal challenge. Mr. Rice has worked with the Planning Department, which has very high standards. He will provide an EIR on this project that we will take the project forward in a complete and adequate manner.

Mr. Rice stated that by working with some of the material generated by the other projects in the Concourse area, we can use a lot of the material and not have to gather information for the first time. Once the parameters of the project are defined enough so that we can analyze the transportation and the other effects, the

EIR process should hope to take about eight or nine months. There are a number of legal steps that require a lot of time in addition to the analysis.

One of the ways that we can keep the project on schedule is to work closely with the consultants so the range of alternatives is an appropriate range that the public will be interested in. The project description is essential. Mr. Rice reported examples of those things that we would need to know. For example, we need to know is where cars are coming in and out of the garage, where pedestrians are brought in and out, what will be the major transit improvements, where parking and circulation will be changed elsewhere. We do not need to know the design of the garage as far as internal ramps or how the space is going to be configured just the basic constructibility. We don't need to know what it will look like below the surface. The major access points and the transportation parameters are the key things.

**DIRECTORS' BUSINESS** allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There was none.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:** Mr. Chris Duderstadt reminded the commission that there are a number of existing companies in San Francisco that perform a similar function as the proposed cultural shuttle. He also wanted clarification about the budget and to know if the funding for the project is in place. Lastly, he passed around a sketch of a people mover that could be used within the park.

CEO Ellzey responded to Mr. Duderstadt's question regarding the budget. He reported that there is no requirement or restriction under Proposition J regarding the nature of funds to be used for the surface improvements. Any component of the project, except for the design and construction of the garage and related improvements may be publicly or privately funded. For example, the central Concourse area is not necessarily restricted to private funds. The Traffic and Feasibility Study and the Implementation Program are budgeted as part of the private funding. However, the overall transportation, parking and transit studies, and the design of the park-wide transit traffic program, do not necessarily have to be funded through private sources. That component of our work could be publicly funded. The work that we are now doing and the people that we have introduced tonight are in connection with the design and construction of the underground parking facility. The only public money spent on Concourse Authority work so far would be the salary and benefits of the CEO and those of the Executive Assistant beginning July 1, 2000. This was budgeted as a result of the passage of Proposition B, which heightened the importance and level of coordination necessary in the Concourse area. It was determined by the city administration that it would be appropriate—and that it would serve the city's interest—to assign a senior administrator to coordinate the series of projects in the Concourse area. Public money budgeted is in the amount of $174, 410 for fiscal 2001 for staff expenses and staff benefits.

Finally, Mr. Duderstadt reminded everyone about a proposal of an observation area. This free entry observation deck can possibly bring many more visitors to the park and that we need more in depth analysis as the problem has not been addressed in the current EIR.

Ms. Jane Nurrie presented the next public comment—see attached.

In response to the comments of Ms. Nurrie, Director Rizzo stated briefly that the City Attorney told us that CEO Ellzey's position had to be a City position.

Further public comment included those from John Laskin. He expressed his discontent in that his comment at a previous meeting had been disregarded. He then re-stated his comment regarding his displeasure with the removal of 800 parking spaces in Golden Gate Park. He believes that it would create a monopoly situation within the parking garage.

Chris Duderstadt requested that there be regular presentation to the public about the funding of the project.

CEO Ellzey took on the responsibility for future disclosure of the budget throughout the project term.

**AJOURNMENT 6:40 P.M.**

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 11 2000

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**TUESDAY, October 10, 2000**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 12, 2000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

   Traffic and Transit Feasibility Study – Marilyn Duffey will report on the status of the Authority's contract under which the Duffey Company is preparing a Traffic and Transportation Feasibility and Implementation Plan for Golden Gate Park, in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

4. **PRESENTATION BY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT.** The Executive Director of the Department of Environment for the City and County of San Francisco will describe the activities, programs and priorities of the Department and the potential opportunities for a working relationship between the Department and the Concourse Authority on its projects. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATEMENTS OF QUALIFICATIONS OF SELECTED PRIME CONSULTANTS FOR THE CONCOURSE AREA PROJECT**. The Chief Executive Officer will recommend that the Board accept the Statements of Qualification for the four prime consultants selected by the CEO to provide technical assistance to the project. Statements of Qualification recommended for acceptance, all of which have previously been submitted to the Board for review and consideration, are for MCK Associates (Project Manager); Gordon H. Chong & Partners (Engineering and Architecture); EIP Associates (Environmental Review) and Public Affairs Management (Community Relations). **(DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION)**

6. **AUTHORIZE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO ENTER INTO 90-DAY "SCOPING" AGREEMENTS WITH SELECTED CONSULTANTS IN AN AGGREGATE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $110,000.** In accordance with the provisions of the ***Policy Governing Contracting Practices for the Design and Construction of an Underground Parking Facility in the Music Concourse Area of Golden Gate Park***, approved by the Board of Directors on August 8, 2000, the Chief Executive Officer will recommend that the Authority enter into agreements with each of the selected prime consultants for the purpose of completing a study of the scope and parameters of the Concourse Authority's projects to determine a preliminary schedule and budget and to begin an evaluation of design alternatives. These agreements will each have a term of ninety (90) days and will in the aggregate not exceed $110,000. **(DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2727**
**Fax: (415) 831-2099**

7. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**

This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 10, 2000 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION**

A regular meeting of the board of directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on October 10, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Rowe Conner, Tammy Haygood, James Lazarus, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan, and John Rizzo.

There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:38 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.** A motion was made to amend item four of the minutes from the previous meeting to state that 'Director Rizzo suggested that Lincoln Park might be considered part of the shuttle route.' The motion was seconded and the minutes approved.

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:** CEO Ellzey introduced Marilyn Duffey from the Duffey Company to report on the status of the Authority's contract under which the Duffey Company is preparing a Traffic and Transportation Feasibility and Implementation Plan for Golden Gate Park, in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998.

Ms. Duffey reported on the progress of the Action Plan. The final product will be in the form of a notebook and will contain all of the information that the Duffey Company has gathered, including summaries of other transportation studies from the Academy of Sciences, MUNI, the G-line, and all relevant data pertaining to transportation issues in the park.

Ms. Duffey then reported on the progress of the cultural shuttle plan. General parameters have been identified. For example, the shuttle plan will explore opportunities such as joining important MUNI lines within the loop, connecting major San Francisco attractions, zero emissions buses, ADA compliance, and bicycle racks. The route, of course, is not yet finalized and we will solicit the public's input. We are looking at a cooperative shuttle from the UCSF garage. Presidio Trust is interested in sharing some CNG vehicles. Grayline has expressed interest in a possible partnership as well. A strong marketing program is recommended in order to get the program started. We also have providers of existing shuttles that are interested in helping the Authority put together our program. A survey is being compiled to define visitors to San Francisco. Ms. Duffey reported that Andy Nash from the Transportation Authority has volunteered to use the Transportation Authority as a repository for the Authority's visitor information. There will be two more meetings of the working group, after which we will compile the minutes and bring to the public a preliminary action plan and the feasibility of such a shuttle.

Ms. Duffey added that Wilbur Smith is working on the preliminary parking space displacement study and at the next meeting we will receive a report on the parking space study. The Duffey Company and Wilbur Smith intend to work with the Bicycle Coalition to get counts of key intersections so that DPT will consider improvements to those intersections.

Ms. Duffey then invited any questions.

Director Lazarus asked if are we considering operation issues at the museums and the Academy in terms of recommending a policy on scheduling that would assure no overlap of special events, opening and closing time, free days, etc. so that peak visitor interest is spread out and doesn't conflict.

Ms. Duffey responded that the Duffey Company has not looked at this, and that it would be expected that the institutions and the Department of Recreation & Parks will cooperate in this effort.

CEO Ellzey added that those issues are outside the scope of the Duffey Company's report, but a team will take that up in a longer-term concourse coordination effort. We will look at this as a part of the community-based traffic and parking plan over the next couple of years.

Director Rizzo was concerned that the San Francisco visitor's survey was asking about visitors in general, not those to Golden Gate Park in particular.



DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 0 8 2001
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Director Haygood has concerns about there being no community members in the working group.

CEO Ellzey responded that a community member has been invited to the second and third meetings and that we will conduct a public meeting in association with this program in the first quarter of 2001.

Director Lum wanted clarification regarding the top ten visitor attractions and whether the shuttle was for visitors only and not for locals who may not be interested in some of the destinations. He wants be sure that the shuttle is attractive to the residents of the city as well.

President Conner had concerns about layering or duplication of existing transit.

Ms. Duffey responded that the Duffey Company has been working with the various city transportation departments since day one and they have been part of the process of the development of the action plan. They are included actively in the planning process.

Public comment from Dr. Konopaski called attention to the Santa Clara County pilot study on a program called dial-a-ride. These were electric vehicles to provide transportation to people who could call up for a small van to arrive at their door like a taxi. This may be something that would suit the need for the cultural shuttle.

Christopher Duderstadt commented that most of the events coordinated by Recreation and Park are not in the Concourse, but Sharon Meadows.

CEO Ellzey responded that for a number of events annually people were willing to park in the UCSF garage and walk into Golden Gate Park. As a part of our Transportation Action Plan, we are contemplating a park and ride relationship with the UCSF garage to accommodate these visitors.

PRESENTATION BY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT: Ms. Francesca Vietor, the Executive Director of the Department of Environment for the City and County of San Francisco, described the activities, programs and priorities of the Department and the potential opportunities for a working relationship between the Department and the Concourse Authority on its projects. Ms. Francesca gave a brief overview and history of DOE. She elaborated on the department's green building program, which was signed into law last year. All city departments are encouraged to submit pilot projects to the Department of Environment for the review of a bio taskforce. One of their other main programs is the clean air program, which explores options as far as alternative fuel and transit first—trying to encourage public transportation. The department is happy to support our efforts, especially with CNG and electric vehicles and will share information regarding successes and challenges and collaboration.

Ms. Vietor reported that she has met with Director Rizzo and Mr. Ellzey on the potential for collaboration in order to make the concourse area project a pilot program. She encouraged that we make our garage a green building. She has several ideas for the parking garage that might be interesting. For example, using the old materials from the Academy and the deYoung to build our new structure, thus "closing the loop" relative to construction within the concourse area. Other ideas include having electric charging stations in the garage, which will profile and highlight alternative fuel, have plenty of bike parking, energy efficiency, such as solar panels that raise and lower the gate. She then encouraged the directors to make the garage a pilot program.

Director MacColl asked if this participation is a voluntary situation and for confirmation on their funding.

Ms. Vietor responded that the participation is voluntary and the funding is a city fund except for the clean air program, which receives general funding for two staff positions. A significant part of the budget is from grants.

President Conner inquired what it means to join into a pilot program.

Ms. Vietor responded that the Authority and DOE would establish the goals together, as each program is unique. Signing up as a pilot is voluntary and non-prescriptive.

Director Rizzo stated that a green garage is a good idea, especially when we consider that the Academy is a pilot project and the cost saving that we could share. There is an educational aspect with the garage becoming a pilot project as well.

CEO Ellzey added that the deYoung will be totally torn down and reconstructed so there will be a lot of opportunity for material during reconstruction. It is an excellent idea to explore a partnership with DOE.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATEMENTS OF QUALIFICATIONS OF SELECTED PRIME CONSULTANTS FOR THE CONCOURSE AREA PROJECT. The CEO recommended that the Board accept the Statements of Qualifications for the four prime consultants selected by the CEO to provide technical assistance to the project. Statements of Qualification recommended for acceptance, all of which have previously been submitted to the Board for review and consideration, are for MCK Associates (Project Advisor/Administrator); Gordon H. Chong & Partners (Engineering and Architecture); EIP Associates (Environmental Review); and Public Affairs Management (Community Relations).

CEO Ellzey reported on the importance of beginning the work on the project. In order to begin we need to preview the Concourse and develop a professional perspective on how to proceed. Then we can get a sense of the scope, the budget, and the schedule by professionals in design and architecture, as well as project administration assistance. Four of the five consultants have been identified. The fifth area is construction management/general contractor, which will be the foundation of the construction process. That area will be identified later based on the early scoping and evaluation of the project.

CEO Ellzey asked that the board approve the four consultants for 90-day agreements based on their statements of qualifications.

Director O'Sullivan asked that CEO Ellzey describe the criteria for the selection process for each candidate.

CEO Ellzey responded that the criteria for selection would be best defined by the scope of services that each candidate would be providing. Project/administrative management for example would be someone who has overseen a project of a large scope, has an engineering degree and background, has administered to project schedules and has worked on projects of at least this size. For design and architecture, the candidate is someone who has done design and architectural work on garage facility projects of this size or greater. The environmental review candidate is someone who has provided environmental review administration, and has successfully processed and certified a final EIR on projects of this scope or greater. The community relations candidate is someone who has participated in an on-going administration of an extensive community relations program, has had public involvement experience in San Francisco, and has familiarity with Recreation and Park's work on projects of this size.

Director Haygood has particular interest in the project management role. She does not understand if we are hiring an individual or an organization and has been unable to find MCK Associates, LLC registered.

CEO Ellzey responded that we are entering into an arrangement with MCK, but in essence we are hiring Brendan McDevitt, regardless of the name of the firm or when it was established.

Director Haygood had questions about Mr. McDevitt's qualifications. MCK consists of Mr. McDevitt and one other person in the organization. He also seems to be subcontracting with an organization by the name of ACE and makes reference to a number of projects on which he is currently working. Does the CEO have any concern that MCK is a two-person organization and you are hiring one specific person from that organization, and the number of projects in which MCK is involved?

CEO Ellzey replied that those things were not of concern. Mr. McDevitt has represented to me and has given me his professional assurance that he is available to do the job that has been asked of him. Mr. McDevitt has been in continual communication via, voicemail, email and personal meetings.

Director Haygood added that it appears that Mr. McDevitt is to be the developer and project manager for a $150 million project for a metal re-mining plant in Mexico as well as be the project advisor in San Francisco. Is this true?

CEO Ellzey responded that he did not want to speak on behalf of MCK, but the short answer is yes. There are several other people working with him on this project and he will not be receiving full time compensation on the Concourse project nor working full time. He will simply serve as technical advisor during the term of the agreement.

Director Haygood stated for the record that although she supports the majority of the CEO's choices, she has grave concerns with MCK Associates and does not believe that they are an organization.

Public comment from Tomasita Medál expressed concern that PAM would set the tone and impact for decisions made regarding the Concourse. Her main issue was to understand whether any paid positions on the staff of PAM were persons of color.

Kay Wilson, president of PAM responded, stating that her firm does include as professionals people of various ethnic backgrounds.

Chris Duderstadt wanted clarification on where the funds for these contracts are coming from.

CEO Ellzey replied that these contracts were a part of the project design effort and that they would be funded from private funds.

There being no further discussion, Director Lazarus moved acceptance of the statements of qualifications submitted by the CEO. The motion was seconded and approved

AUTHORIZE THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO ENTER INTO 90-DAY "SCOPING" AGREEMENTS WITH SELECTED CONSULTANTS IN AN AGGREGATE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $110,000. In accordance with the provisions of the *Policy Governing Contracting Practices for the Design and Construction of an Underground Parking Facility in the Music Concourse Area of Golden Gate Park,* approved by the Board of Directors on August 8, 2000, the Chief Executive Officer will recommend that the Authority enter into agreements with each of the selected prime consultants for the purpose of completing a study of the scope and parameters of the Concourse Authority's projects to determine a preliminary schedule and budget and to begin an evaluation of design alternatives. These agreements will each have a term of ninety (90) days and will in the aggregate not exceed $110,000.

CEO Ellzey made it clear that in his opinion it was essential that we get moving on this project. We need to begin with a professional service group that can go out and look at the project so that we can begin to evaluate design alternatives and begin to develop a schedule and a budget. This is essential for development of the MOU with our funders. It will enable the funders to present a formalized plan and relationship to any perspective donors so that questions can be answered and clarifications can be made available. This is a critical juncture for us and it is absolutely time to get on with the project.

Although there are some uncertainties as to the flow of funds, this garage project is privately funded as stipulated by Proposition J. Those funds are being collected every day through the hard work of Hirsch and Associates and many others. We are now wrestling with some interpretive issues relative to the structure of the organization. The Concourse Authority was created by the City and therefore is a city agency. Our original understanding was that the Concourse Authority would process the money, but it appears as though once the Authority touches the money, it becomes city money and is subject to restrictions attached to those funds. As that may or may not be acceptable to the Concourse Authority board, I am proposing that I be authorized to enter into or cause to have executed these interim agreements, should the private funders agree. As a result, we could have a project agreement directly executed between the funders and the service providers. For administrative purposes, the Concourse Authority will potentially be a 3rd party to that agreement. At the conclusion of the 90-day work scope, that work can then be gifted to the Authority as a gift-in-kind work product.

CEO Ellzey then reported that we have identified the source of the funds but have not agreed upon the form of the transfer, or whether the transfer of funds to the Authority is an appropriate way to go. The funds now

reside for the purpose of the design and construction of the underground parking facility at the Community Initiative Funds as a part of the San Francisco Foundation.

Director Lazarus clarified that we are talking about simple 90-day interim contracts while issues are being worked out with the city attorney to recommend to us a course of action for the ultimate funding and contracting mechanism for long-term contracts.

CEO Ellzey replied that that is exactly why we are doing this. It is the city attorney's recommendation that they develop a regular, standard, boiler-plate agreement that would attach to each of the four consultants' scope and budget, so that there would be four agreements with standard terms and conditions for a 90-day scope of service for these not-to-exceed amounts.

Director Lazarus asked that they include upon the recommendation of the city attorney a standard insurance provision protecting the Authority as well as the private donors and whoever the interim contracting party might be as well.

CEO Ellzey replied that we have two types of contracts working. One contract would be if we were to contract directly and the other is if the funders and the service providers contracted directly.

Director Haygood had concerns that we are putting forth a motion that would allow us to contract for $110,000 when we don't know were the money is coming from and believes that it is irresponsible for us to do so.

Director O'Sullivan also wasn't comfortable voting for an agreement that she did not see before her.

Director Lazarus indicated that the vote is to enable the CEO to enter into this 90-day process while we work with the city attorney to get the final, long term contracts. We are not voting on the agreements themselves. The long-term contracts will be presented at a future meeting for voting approval. Inherent in this motion today is that the money has been identified so that the contractors will be paid.

Director Lazarus added that each contract is a small amount of money, and at some point our director ought to be authorized to enter into contracts of short term and low cash value without coming to us. Every department head of the city can do that to some degree.

There being no public comment on item 6, a motion was made to execute the scoping agreements for the not-to-exceed amounts. The motion was seconded and approved.

DIRECTORS' BUSINESS. President Conner asked the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings.

Director Haygood would like to discuss an acceptable lead-time for materials that are to be acted on by the board. She would like to have a policy that would not allow us to act on items that are not received in a timely fashion.

President Conner would like to discuss what sort of contracts and dollar amounts that the CEO can enter into without our board approval.

PUBLIC COMMENT: President Conner invited the public to address the Commission.

Tomasita Médal commented that she had concerns regarding PAM, and fairness in assisting and facilitating public meetings. She asked that PAM be particularly sensitive to all of the outlying neighborhoods in San Francisco to make sure that the entire community of San Francisco can enjoy and have better access to our park.

Chris Duderstadt reminded everyone of the Internet site at www.sfpix.com/concourse. He then pointed out to the Commission that if you create a garage in San Francisco, it would fill with cars. He suggested that there be a 3 or 4 hour limit unless we want commuters to use it. We must accept that this garage will serve

commuters during the week and that we must take this into consideration. And lastly, he said that he has posted another report called 'wear your old shoes.' The article deals with considerations within the Concourse as well.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

NOV 14 2000

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**TUESDAY, November 14, 2000**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 10, 2000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

   **Lead Time for Board Review of Supporting Materials Prior to Taking Action** – As a follow-up on a Directors' Business discussion from the October 10th Board Meeting, the President will facilitate a discussion of this policy and administrative matter. (DISCUSSION ONLY)

   **Delegation of Signature Authority to CEO** – As a follow-up on a Directors' Business discussion from the October 10th Board Meeting, the President will review a survey done by staff of a number of City departments regarding delegation of signature authority to department heads for various contract types. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

   **Traffic and Transit Feasibility Study** – The CEO will report on the status of the Authority's contract under which the Duffey Company is preparing a Traffic and Transportation Feasibility and Implementation Plan for Golden Gate Park, in accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

   **Contracting Status for Project Consultants and Status of Memorandum of Understanding** – The CEO, as a follow-up to action taken by the Board on October 10th which authorized the CEO to enter into, or cause to have executed, 90-day scoping agreements with four project consultants, will report on the status of this action. In addition, the CEO will report on the status of the memorandum of understanding to be entered into between the Concourse Authority, on behalf of the City, and a philanthropic, non-profit organization, and possibly the Department of Recreation and Park, for the purpose of defining the interrelationship, entitlements and obligations between or among the parties for the funding and administration of the underground parking facility and related Music Concourse area and Golden Gate Park projects and improvements.

5. **PRESENTATION BY WILBUR SMITH ASSOCIATES ON THE DRAFT PARKING ASSESSMENT REPORT.** A representative of Wilbur Smith Associates will report on the initial draft of the Parking Assessment Report, which provides for initial recommendations to the Concourse

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

Authority for the removal of parking spaces in the Music Concourse area and the remainder of Golden Gate Park, in accordance with the provisions of Proposition J. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **PRESENTATION BY DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARK REGARDING CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE LANDSCAPE AND ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK.** A representative of the Department of Recreation and Park will describe for the Board certain landscape and roadway improvements being planned by the Department for Golden Gate Park, in accordance with the Golden Gate Park Master Plan. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

7. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**

This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 14, 2000 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION**

A regular meeting of the board of directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on November 14, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Rowe Conner, Tammy Haygood, James Lazarus, John Lum, and Stephanie MacColl. Margaret O'Sullivan and John Rizzo arrived while the meeting was in progress.

There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**. A motion was made to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. The motion was seconded and the minutes approved.

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT.** As a follow-up on a Directors' Business item from the October 10th Board Meeting, President Conner facilitated a discussion on the lead-time for Board Review of supporting materials prior to taking action. President Conner asked the board for their opinion and opened the discussion on what type of lead-time would be appropriate.

The response from the Board regarding a lead-time ranged from four days to two weeks. Generally it was felt that the earlier items were received, the better. This would enable the Board to make responsible decisions regarding action items. Everyone agreed that it is not always possible for staff to provide current updates in a timely manner when items come in and changes occur every day. President Conner acknowledged everyone's opinions and, although this is not an action item, asked staff that a good faith effort is made in order to get the materials delivered by the Thursday before Tuesday's board meetings.

CEO Ellzey commented that his role is to get the information to the board as soon as possible. Staff will do the best possible, especially with respect to action items. As we begin to move into more action-oriented items and we go further into this project; staff will try to build a schedule into the calendar that will meet the directors' needs.

As a follow-up on a Directors' Business item from the October 10 Board meeting, President Conner raised the issue of delegation of signature authority to the CEO. After a review of a survey done by staff, President Conner asked that a summary is done and that we come forward at a future meeting with an actual policy based upon the survey.

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:** CEO Ellzey reported on the update of the Traffic and Transit Feasibility study that is being done by the Duffey Company in accordance with section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. As a side note, he reported that he made a presentation to SPUR, and it is evident that the Concourse Authority is becoming more involved publicly and its charter is considered to be important. As far as the Transportation Action Plan, a preliminary draft is expected to be presented to the Authority in December.

The next step will be to begin our public involvement plan. We expect that to begin in the first quarter of next year. Some of the items for review in the action plan draft are as follows.

- Implementation of an intra-park shuttle system for all attractions within Golden Gate Park
- Access to the park road system on the northern side of the park
- Traffic calming measures to mitigate highway-type traffic patterns
- Time limited parking throughout the park on weekdays to discourage non-park, commuter use
- A cultural shuttle that we anticipate will carry visitors from major downtown and transit location to and from the park
- A bicycle plan and skating lane and passes within the park
- Road closures within the park in accordance with the Golden Gate Park Master Plan
- Expanding use of the nearby hospital garages via shuttle for overflow use
- Muni service improvements



DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

- Traffic-roadway landscaping and other infrastructure improvements to facilitate transition to a park where the automobile is increasingly less visible.

Director MacColl asked for clarification about process and whether or not the information published in the draft was available to the public, the institutions, and all those affected by the plan.

CEO Ellzey responded that as soon as the information is distributed to the board, it becomes public. The information will then be available upon request to our executive assistant at 831-2727. We also have a pretty massive email and mailing list. Furthermore, we anticipate that during the first quarter of next year we will have established our own website upon which this information will be posted. Marilyn Duffey added that it is the intention of the Duffey Company to provide the binders toward the end of December, but not in time for the December meeting. It is expected that the plan would be accepted at January board meeting.

Public comment from Chris Duderstadt asked if we would expect that the attendance figures for the Academy and the deYoung projection will be part of this plan.

CEO Ellzey responded affirmatively.

Mary Anne Miller asked whether the transportation workshops were open to the public.

CEO Ellzey answered that, although they are considered to be staff workshops, a member of the community does attend. We will follow up with a publicly noticed, publicly held community workshop during the first quarter of next year based on the results of our workshops with no actions items depending on it. The community input would contribute to the final plan.

The second item under the CEOs report provided the board with a summary of activities associated with the contracting process and the Memorandum of Understanding that would be developed to define the interrelationships among the parties involved in our project.

CEO Ellzey gave a brief background of the Authority's requirements with regard to Proposition J. The originally contemplated method for contracting would be that the Concourse Authority accepts and receives funds from an outside funding agency and then contracts directly with a series of service providers, consultants and contractors. The Authority would pay invoices directly out of a Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority bank account. However, it is the opinion of the city attorney's office, that since the City and County of San Francisco created the Concourse Authority, it is considered to be a public agency. It follows that the original contemplated method of receiving and disbursing funds does not appear to be the optimum way to approach the project. We have since met with the city attorneys, the mayor's office, RecPark and with the funders. It has been agreed that the method of contracting under a 90-day process would be that the private funders keep the funds that they have collected and contract directly with the service providers and consultants; not with the Concourse Authority. The Concourse Authority would then work in a cooperative way in the execution of these agreements. The Concourse Authority would expect to be offered a gift of this work product and be expected to accept this gift near the conclusion of this 90-day period. So it continues to be a privately funded project. It appears as though, at least for the time being, we will continue to evaluate a method of contracting that is directly between a private 501(c)(3) and the consultants. This is a much more fluid way to approach the contracting. Beginning in February, the CEO will be reporting together with these consultants to the board each and every month on the progress of these contracts. This form of contracting will most likely be proposed at some time in the future as the form of long-term contracting for the project agreements. This appears to be the method desired by the city administration as well as by the funders.

That having been said, next week we will begin discussion on an MOU that will be either between or among the Concourse Authority and the funders, or the Concourse Authority, the RecPark Commission and the funders. The purpose of the MOU is to specifically define the rights, entitlements and obligations of the various parties in association with completing this project. This is a complex project and an extraordinary public/private partnership. Before we get involved in project agreements, it is very important for us to understand the interrelationships between the Concourse Authority, the Recreation and Park Department, the RecPark Commission, the funders, the mayor's office, etc. The proposed MOU will eventually be brought to this board for approval.

In response to President Conner's inquiry regarding the timeline for the MOU, CEO Ellzey responded that there is quite a bit of work being done to identify the various issues that are to be contemplated by this MOU. He expects the first of the negotiating meetings will take place within a week. It is his expectation that there will be significant progress in December. It is his intention to get this agreement to the Board of Supervisors in January.

Director Lazarus and CEO Ellzey assured attendees that Proposition J, the ordinance that created the Authority, requires that all actions of the Authority are subject to review by the RecPark Commission. The Authority provides notice of its actions and provides the Commission the opportunity to calendar them on their own calendar. The MOU would not change that.

In response to Director Haygood's request for clarification, CEO Ellzey answered that the "director" referred to on the contract would be the project director for the MCGF, which is Susan Hirsch. The method of signatory just changed this afternoon. MCGF chooses to execute this agreement directly because they are the holders of the funds. It will be Susan Hirsch, Project Director for the MCGF, the current holders of the funds.

The next item was taken out of order.

**PRESENTATION BY DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION AND PARK REGARDING CURRENT AND PROSPECTIVE LANDSCAPE AND ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS TO GOLDEN GATE PARK.** Dan McKenna from the Recreation and Park Department described for the board certain landscape and roadway improvements being planned by the department for Golden Gate Park, in accordance with the Golden Gate Park Master Plan.

Mr. McKenna gave a brief overview of some of the policies related to the circulation plan. Some of the highlights of the plan are as follows:

- Create and maintain a system of recreational pathways, trails and roadways where the order of priority should be to accommodate pedestrians, bicycles and vehicle for the purpose of enjoying the park
- Minimize the impact of motor vehicles on the park experience
- Insure access to all; especially the mobility impaired, senior citizens, and families w/ children
- Address the need for access for all travel modes in the park with priorities placed in the following order; pedestrians, bicycles and motor vehicles
- Reduce the impacts of motor vehicles, particularly those that are using the park as an east/west through route or for parking only
- Improve access for people coming to the park for recreational purposes
- Improve access by modes such as pedestrian, bicycles and transit
- Improve accessibility to park features for all, including seniors, persons with disabilities and families with young children

Mr. McKenna then highlighted the road closure program in Golden Gate Park as part of the Golden Gate Park Master Plan. Among the highlights were traffic-calming measures, specifically the landscape extension plans. They have been designed with DPT and are at the conceptual stage. These will be along JFK Drive between Kezar and the Rose Garden and are presumed to be part of the Duffey plan of removing 800-1000 parking spaces. These extensions will be landscape extensions into the present day roadway and not only reduce the tendency for cars to use an unapproved two lanes of traffic for commuting, but slow the east west traffic on JFK. Also this fiscal year RecPark will be installing the commuter parking restrictions in and around Middle Drive East and Martin Luther King. This will improve accessibility to the features of the park and to discourage the use of the park as a commuter parking area.

Mr. McKenna then invited questions.

President Conner remarked that although everybody is clearly for traffic calming, there are some opinions that there may be other modes of accomplishing traffic calming on JFK other than or better than the landscape extensions that may be advantageous. How do you see this working out if certain traffic-calming suggestions from the Duffey Company prove more advantageous to the landscape extensions?

Mr. McKenna suggested that those ideas and proposals be brought forward to the RecPark Commission for review. At that time public comment could also be incorporated into the commission's understanding of the

issue. We will have the opportunity to consider something that has been advanced to this commission that dovetails very closely in the work that is being done by the department of RecPark under the Master Plan. The commission will be looking for our input and it will be duly considered. It looks at though the shared roadway planning and the traffic calming work being considered by RecPark is a perfect opportunity for us to work together to advance a unified voice to the RecPark Commission.

Dr. Konopaski from the Richmond District took issue with the statement that "everyone is in favor of traffic calming". He felt that "traffic calming" is a politically correct term that has been coined and what it really stands for is traffic obstruction. As a resident of the Richmond District, he felt that some of these measures would deny residents access. These obstructions without an alternate route would create major tie-ups. This is already a problem on Sunday's on Stanyan Street. There are serious problems with pedestrian safety and if we are going to force more traffic onto our city streets by closing this route through the park, it will impact heavily on the safety issues as well. He encourages consideration of these facts while determining road closures.

**PRESENTATION BY WILBUR SMITH ASSOCIATES ON THE DRAFT PARKING ASSESSMENT REPORT.** Luba Wyznyckyj of Wilbur Smith Associates reported on the initial draft of the Parking Assessment Report, which provides for initial recommendations to the Concourse Authority for the removal of parking spaces in the Music Concourse area and the remainder of Golden Gate Park, in accordance with the provisions of Proposition J.

Ms. Wyznyckyj presented the methodology and criteria that were used to identify parking spaces and an initial set of recommended locations for eliminating parking. Some of the criteria that were used for eliminating parking spaces were derived from Proposition J. For example, all surface spaces in the Music Concourse area are to be removed. The second criterion was that spaces be removed as part of the permanent road closures couldn't be counted. Wilbur Smith developed additional criteria as well. One criterion is that in order to get the best utilization for the garage, there should be a minimum number of free parking spaces competing in the vicinity. Another criterion regards traffic congestion. The areas that experience congestion in the vicinity of the concourse and throughout the park should be considered. Safety is another issue and builds upon the Master Plan which desires improved bicycle and pedestrian flow throughout the park, and calls for the eliminating parking spaces at intersections and locations where pedestrian pathways cross major roadways.

The Wilbur Smith assessment considered the Golden Gate Park Master Plan in developing the plan of the Concourse Authority. Wilbur Smith Associates also conducted comprehensive field surveys of the parking supply and of utilization in the park on weekdays and weekends. These surveys were done primarily in July and some were conducted in October. Overall there were about 16 actions in the Master Plan that affected parking in the park. These improvements eliminate about 200 spaces throughout the park. These improvements change the time limits from all-day free parking in the eastern portion of the park to 3-4 hour parking limits. Traffic calming improvements are currently being planned. There are initial discussions with RecPark on how we can combine some the Wilbur Smith proposals along with their plans.

Wilbur Smith Associates have identified seven categories for the elimination parking spaces. The concourse is the most obvious which results in about 200 spaces. Martin Luther King Drive south of the concourse is a proposed 140. On Middle Drive east there have been 150 spaces identified on both sides of the street. On JFK north of the concourse they have identified 185 spaces. These are spaces immediately adjacent to the music concourse. In total there are about 670 spaces.

Another category is park entrances in which 45 spaces have been identified. These spaces are located primarily on 8th and 10th Avenues and accommodate the entrances and exits to the garage. Martin Luther King in the western part of the park between 30th and 41st Avenue is a narrow and winding two-way road, which RecPark has identified as a problem location. Removing spaces at selected locations on the south side of this road in different sections, account for another 100 spaces.

The last category is the removal of parking spaces at intersections and crosswalks. These have been identified throughout the park and are located where roadways intersect or cross pedestrian and bicycle paths. It is possible to remove one to three spaces at each of the approaches to these intersections. In some locations we have identified more than three for safety purposes or because of narrow roadways. These would improve the sight distances for the pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers.

In total, Wilbur Smith Associates has identified about 1000 spaces that could be eliminated in accordance with Proposition J. A majority of them are in the immediate vicinity of the Music Concourse and the remainder is scattered throughout the park per the above criteria. There are other opportunities for eliminating parking in the park and she invited suggestions so that Wilbur Smith could review and refine their recommendations.

CEO Ellzey interjected that there has been a recent development after the distribution of this report. He has had conversations with both museum directors the director of the Academy of Sciences and they have registered objections to certain portions of these findings.

Director Lazarus raised concerns over these findings as well. Although he advocates the removal of spaces at entrances of the park and places where there are safety issues, he feels that some recommendations could be very damaging. He specifically mentioned the removal of spaces near the polo fields that are highly occupied on any weekend in October. The parking limitations around the polo fields will be a huge impact to families from all over San Francisco. There are many recreational uses in that area, such as the horses and Stow Lake, as well as the polo fields. Furthermore, he believes that there should be some free parking available nearby the concourse. Those who can afford it will park in the garage for convenience while others will park as far away as parking is available in order to save money. There might also be on street, permit parking for the staff and volunteers of the museums and the academy.

Ms. Wyznyckyj responded that any free or permit parking is something that needs to be decided as a policy issue. Regarding the use of polo grounds, Wilbur Smith Associates tried to make sure that there is some parking available within walking distance to those areas that get used every day. The elimination of parking spaces throughout the park is part of the action plan. Moreover, there will be an intra-park shuttle so that families who come for an event can easily park in the garage and then take the shuttle.

President Conner asked for a review of the assessment criteria. It seems that the first criterion is the proximity to the concourse area itself. She felt that that is a little self-serving and it should be more about access to park visitors. She expressed concerns that there are people that will not be able to afford the garage. It seems that the priority should be given to areas of heavy traffic congestion and environmental sensitivity. This is a great balancing act and we are in the position to try to the best job that we can for park visitors.

CEO Ellzey added that this will be quite a complex process because of its controversial nature. For every idea that one person suggests for one area of displacement, someone else will have a contrary view. But as far as process, this draft report from Wilbur Smith Associates is the first opportunity for the presentation of parking space elimination. As the process unfolds, we will collect comments and information; there will be meetings with staff and consultants and perhaps the institutions. And perhaps at the next meeting we can talk about the products of those discussions. Additionally, this project will be the basis for public involvement and community outreach in the first quarter of next year. This whole process of parking space displacement will take some time.

CEO Ellzey wanted to know if Wilbur Smith Associates was suggesting that from a professional transportation, traffic and parking planning perspective, that eliminating parking first near the concourse area is something that by design is an essential component to a successful garage operation.

Ms. Wyznyckyj responded that that there needs to be some more work on the garage in assessing the feasibility, identifying the users, and how the proximity criteria apply.

CEO Ellzey added that the Concourse Authority is responsible for designing a transportation and parking management plan for the concourse area and the entire park. We will be talking with the community about permit parking and timed parking programs that may mitigate the need to canvas the concourse area for parking space removal. It seems that there are all sorts of opportunities here and as we have seen today, there will be a lot of controversy over the ultimate displacement of spaces. Initially it is important to identify every space that has safety related or traffic congestion issues, add to that the concourse area spaces and then see what we have left.

Mary Anne Miller commented that in the west end of the park there would be no effect from the building of a garage. Between 30th and 41st Avenues the removal of parking spaces on Martin Luther King Drive doesn't make sense. That section is very dangerous and nobody parks there anyway. The Concourse Authority shouldn't get credit for those spaces if nobody ever parks there. We are looking for a real 800 or 1000 spaces being removed.

CEO Ellzey responded that Proposition J requires that the Concourse Authority not only remove all of the surface spaces in the concourse area, but throughout the park. We have a park-wide responsibility and it is not necessarily related to traffic emanating from the garage facility itself. It's an opportunity to look at the entire park.

Harry Parker, Director of the Fine Arts Museums commented on the proposal and on its many excellent suggestions. However, he has concerns regarding the assumption that the removal of the staff and volunteer parking lot next to the deYoung\ would not count towards the 1000 space deletion directive. There is no reason why it shouldn't count. Furthermore, much of the parking on John F. Kennedy Drive will be removed and that is part of the Master Plan. Mr. Parker implored the commission to bear in mind the distinction between John F. Kennedy Drive on weekends and weekdays. JFK is extensively used on weekdays, and is the primary parking area for people coming to the deYoung. If we remove all free parking on JFK from McLaren to Stow, not only do we tie up the Conservatory and the McLaren Lodge, but also you are going to eliminate the free parking that has been a very important need for seniors and volunteers trying to get to the museum. If you don't permit some kind of free parking either on Middle Drive east and a portion JFK, you are going to put all of the staff and volunteer parking demand into the garage. Without any concession for permit parking for the institutions, you are going to create a huge financial issue for the volunteers and/or the museum to provide parking in that garage. This is a delicate issue and one that we should all discuss. We need to find some way to reconcile all of these issues and get on with this process and come up with a plan that we can all live with.

**DIRECTORS' BUSINESS.** President Conner asked the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. It was requested that Wilbur Smith Associates and RecPark have a conversation to discuss the best way to include the issue of Saturday closure in a future proposal. Also it was suggested that CEO Ellzey talk to the parking consultants regarding the parking situation in order to get more information on the parking needs of the institutions in Golden Gate Park.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**: President Conner invited the public to address the Commission.

Chris Duderstadt commented on the Saturday closure issue and an alternative to Proposition F. His measure would call for a Saturday closure from 8th Avenue east and that would leave a majority of the parking on JFK for the institutions and also allow traffic to move from the concourse through 8th Avenue. When the garage is in place, there may be discussion on the rest. Secondly, sfpix.com is now all concourse. He invited everyone to view his website and email him me if there is anything that needs changing.

Tomasita Medál doesn't think that closing off the parking at the Conservatory of Flowers is a good idea. That area is a top draw for tourists. On weekdays Golden Gate Park is a very mellow place for people and there are always those who come near the Conservatory just to sun bathe. She asked that there be access to the Conservatory and the tennis courts and those areas are kept open for the regular folks who aren't so passionately involved and polarized on this issue. She then encouraged the Authority to look to Crissy Field as a model for creating a harmonious boulevard for cyclists, skaters, pedestrians, and automobiles.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

# NOTICE OF CANCELLATION

**Regular Meeting**

**of the**

**GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY**

**The regular meeting of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority scheduled for December 14, 2000 is cancelled.**

**The next regular Board meeting of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority will be held on January 9, 2001.**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

# 2001

## BOARD MEETING CALENDAR

THE REGULAR MEETINGS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY ARE HELD ON THE SECOND TUESDAY OF EACH MONTH AT 4:30 P.M., CITY HALL, ROOM 408. THE DATES FOR THESE MEETINGS IN 2001 ARE AS FOLLOWS:

JANUARY 9, 2001

FEBRUARY 13, 2001

MARCH 13, 2001

APRIL 10, 2001

MAY 8, 2001

JUNE 12, 2001

JULY 10, 2001

AUGUST 14, 2001

SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

OCTOBER 9, 2001

NOVEMBER 13, 2001

DECEMBER 11, 2001

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

cLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
)1 Stanyan Street
an Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

01-10-01A11:19 RCVD

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, January 9, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

JAN 10 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

to late to post
postmarked 1/4/01 rec'd 1/10/01

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 14, 2000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

   Concourse Authority Board Meeting Schedule for 2001. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

   **Traffic and Transit Feasibility Study** - The Duffey Company will provide the Board with an update on the status of the Transportation Action Plan, developed for the Concourse Authority under the provisions of Section 8 (Feasibility and Implementation Plan) of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

   **Update on the Draft Parking Assessment Report** - The CEO will provide the Board with an update on the status of the Draft Parking Assessment Report presented formally to the Board at its November meeting by Wilbur Smith & Associates. (DISCUSSION ONLY)

5. **PRESENTATION BY THE DUFFEY COMPANY ON DISCUSSIONS REGARDING AN INTRAPARK SHUTTLE AND A "CULTURAL" SHUTTLE FOR GOLDEN GATE PARK.** A representative of The Duffey Company will report on the initial findings of a working group regarding the possibility and feasibility of various shuttle program opportunities servicing Golden Gate Park. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **PRESENTATION BY THE STRYBING ARBORETUM AND BOTANICAL GARDENS (SAN FRANCISCO RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT).** A representative of the Strybing Arboretum and Botanical Gardens, located near the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park, will introduce the Strybing's organization, programs and plans, and will discuss the Strybing's interest in collaborating with the Concourse Authority in the construction of the underground parking facility and the development of surface, roadway and traffic improvements in the Music Concourse and the remainder of the Park. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

7. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**

This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

F
15
/01

# MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 9, 2001 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on January 9, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, Tammy Haygood, John Lum, Margaret O'Sullivan and John Rizzo. Stephanie MacColl and James Lazarus were absent.

There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.**

A motion was made to amend the minutes of the November meeting in Dan McKenna's report regarding landscape extensions. The extensions are to be along JKF Drive and not Kezar. Additionally, in the same paragraph, it should read "presumed to be part of the Duffey plan of removing 800-1000 parking spaces."

The motion was seconded and the minutes approved.

Howard Strassner of the Sierra Club requested that the minutes be available via email.

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT.**

President Conner reported that, in the New Year, the Concourse Authority Board would continue to meet on the second Tuesday of each month at 4:30 in Room 408 in City Hall. At the June 12th meeting, there will be the election of officers.

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT.**

CEO Ellzey reported on the Traffic and Transit Feasibility Study. The Duffey Company will provide the Board with an update on the status of the Transportation Action Plan, developed for the Concourse Authority under the provisions of Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. In summary, Proposition J, under Section 8, calls for a traffic and transit feasibility study, the result of which will be a study that will be proposed to the Board for its acceptance at the February meeting. It is expected that staff would receive direction to develop an implementation plan on those matters in that feasibility study deemed to be feasible for possible implementation. The Concourse Authority is attempting to develop a transit first action plan that will commence as soon as practicable and will then dovetail into a full operational transportation and parking management plan preparatory to opening the facilities. In the interim there are opportunities for a reduction in reliance on the automobile in and around the Concourse area and an increase in transit opportunities. Information will be provided to the Concourse Authority in advance of the February meeting. The complete report will contain the following information:

- Draft Matrix of Transportation Action for Consideration
- Summary of Related Studies
- Visitor Data
- Intra-Park and Cultural Shuttle Proposals and Background Information
- Recommended Traffic Calming Measures and Road Closures in the Park
- Parking Recommendations
- Proposed Bicycle Improvements
- Expanded use of Hospital Garage Shuttles
- MUNI Improvements

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

The Board will consider this matter at February's regular meeting and the CEO will request that the Board accept the study and direct the staff to undertake implementation planning work of staff.

The second item under the CEO's report was an update on the Draft Parking Assessment Report. CEO Ellzey provided the Board with an update on the status of the Draft Parking Assessment Report presented formally to the Board at its November meeting by Wilbur Smith & Associates. The Draft Parking Assessment Report elicited significant comment both from the Board as well as from the community. The Concourse Authority has received a number of

communications from the public regarding this report. Additionally, we have heard from all of the major institutions in and around the Concourse area. The initial parking program study that was done by Wilbur Smith Associates was a good first attempt at this very complex and somewhat controversial issue. The draft report did exactly what we wanted it to do and that was to elicit community response. The Concourse Authority will be considering this very carefully over the next year or two. This will be a full component of the public outreach program that will be conducted by the Authority. Wilbur Smith did a good job in recognizing some of the issues that have been raised. Response to these issues will be addressed in its report in February.

Director Rizzo wanted some clarification regarding the language of the feasibility study and whether or not the Board is to accept a Traffic and Transit "study" or and Traffic and Transit "plan".

CEO Ellzey replied that the nomenclature we have been using is "Transportation Action Plan." The feasibility study is the first phase, with the implementation plan to follow. The terminology should be Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan. Staff would prepare a proposed plan of implementation over a period of time. The implementation plan is a precursor to receiving private funds under Proposition J for implementation programs, which could include programs ranging from striping bicycle lanes to developing an intrapark shuttle program. These implementation funds will be allocated based on Board vote and recommendations made by staff.

Director Rizzo stated that he hopes that this plan will not be the end of traffic and transit issues and encourages public input.

CEO Ellzey clarified that the completion of the Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan will represent the beginning of the traffic and transit evaluation. These are two separate and distinct transit/traffic-related responsibilities granted to the Concourse Authority. The first, under Section 8, is the development of a feasibility study and implementation plan. That study will make recommendations to the Board and, based upon Board approval, monies will become available for programs that were deemed to be feasible. The second responsibility, under Section 2, is to design and implement a traffic and parking management plan for the Concourse area and the remainder of the park. This transportation and parking management plan will be the essence around which much of the public involvement program evolves.

Howard Strassner commented that it seems that the public will not be able to offer any comments on the draft and that is going to be a shortcoming to the ultimate plan. If a draft is approved without public input you might miss something, whereas if the public made some comments you might expand the study and make it better. Everybody should have a couple of weeks to review the plan, not just the Board.

CEO Ellzey responded that we would only be asking the Board to accept the draft. Once the draft has been accepted, then deliberation with the community will begin, beginning with the Authority's monthly board meetings as well as expressly called public meetings for the purpose of reviewing and evaluating traffic, transit and parking issues.

Director Rizzo agreed with Mr. Strassner and suggested that we post the draft on the website when the Board receives its copy and let the public know what the URL of the website is so that they can get a chance to read it.

Phil Carleton from the Alliance from Golden Gate Park asked when the draft would be available to the public, in what form it is expected, and how we would be notified.

CEO Ellzey replied that when it becomes available for distribution to the Board, it would become available to the public and stressed that the report that is going to be issued is the conclusion of the first preliminary draft and by definition it will be presented to the Board as such. Its acceptance signifies the beginning of the public review process.

Director Rizzo drew attention to the importance of choosing the correct language. Accepting a "study" is different from approving a "plan." If we are approving a plan, it needs adequate public review—even if it is a draft. If we are accepting a study, that is different. That is a deliverable package of data for us to look at.

CEO Ellzey replied that, indeed, the Board will be asked to accept a study.

Director Haygood clarified that the Duffey Company is actually completing this document in cooperation with and at the direction of our staff. Therefore, initially there needs to be an agreement between the Duffey Company and the staff that the document is representative of what the staff wants to present to the Board. Once it is presented to the Board it

is also presented to the public. The first step allows for comment and review outside of the public's eye. This is to make sure that the staff feels that this is representative of their work.

Ms. Duffey added that once the draft plan is turned over to the Concourse Authority, it should no longer be referred to as the Duffey Plan or the Wilbur Smith Plan. It will be your plan to present to the public for comment. We just provided some assistance in its development.

**PRESENTATION BY THE DUFFEY COMPANY ON DISCUSSIONS REGARDING AN INTRAPARK SHUTTLE AND A "CULTURAL" SHUTTLE FOR GOLDEN GATE PARK.**

Marilyn Duffey of the Duffey Company reported on the initial findings of a working group regarding the possibility and feasibility of various shuttle program opportunities servicing Golden Gate Park. The intrapark shuttle is the shuttle that would run inside the park connecting the attractions and links to transit. Wilbur Smith Associates has put together a number of potential routes that range from 8.5 to 10 miles and loop through the park along Martin Luther King and John F. Kennedy Drive providing access to the west end of the park. The shuttle concept would provide frequent service through the park every 10-15 minutes.

At a minimum, it would start as pilot program to begin during the peak visitor season and on weekends. The idea is to phase in the shuttle in order to see the kind of usage it attracts. Then, if there is a lot of use and deemed successful, the service can be increased over time. There would be designated stops and maps made available to park users that show where they could get on the shuttle. For expediency, the shuttle would loop in two directions.

We have done some preliminary cost estimates and the vehicles themselves would range between $150K to a little over $300K for a new, 40-passenger bus. The operating costs would range from $300-400,000 for the pilot program. These figures are based on expenses associated with existing shuttles. The recommended actions proposed in the feasibility and implementation study are that the Concourse Authority would prepare and issue an RFP for an intrapark shuttle and to begin service as early as this summer. The construction schedule of the de Young Museum will be considered. Through our working group, we have identified some potential funding sources. We will be working with the Clean Air Program and the Transportation Authority to identify further grant programs that may be available to us. After ridership increases, the recommended long-term actions are increased shuttle frequency and connection with the N-Judah.

President Conner suggested that, since JFK is open to para-transit vehicles during Sunday road closure, it might make sense to include the shuttle so that people could park in the west end of the park. This would also give access to the Conservatory of Flowers.

Ms. Duffey stated that the concept of the Sunday road closure is to free up that portion of JFK for walking, bicycling and skating. However, you may be able to have a dedicated lane on JFK for the shuttle. JFK is a very wide thoroughfare.

President Conner asked if the study that is being prepared would provide some costs. Although we have limited monies for implementation, we don't have a budget for the operational costs of running such a shuttle program. So the extent to which the implementation is feasible will relate to funding issues.

Ms. Duffey said that they have some suggestions but, until we receive public input and the plan is further clarified, it's going to be difficult for us to provide a reliable figure. At this point we have a lot of comparable studies that lend themselves to this. We can provide only ballpark figures.

Director Haygood reported that on a recent trip to Chicago she had the opportunity to observe the success of Chicago's shuttle, which does extensive advertising within the city. She asked whether the impact of advertising was considered in the study as a means of paying for the operational costs or even for the buses.

Ms. Duffey answered that the Duffey Company has included in the feasibility study the recommendation for private advertising on the intrapark shuttles. Small closed circuit screens like those found in elevators would represent an example of advertising opportunity. Such screens would not only provide a space on which to advertise, but also would be used to provide visitor information about the history of Golden Gate Park as well as the activities and events that are occurring in the park. The shuttle will also include information provided at all MUNI stops along Stanyan, Fell, and Lincoln Streets that would advise riders of the service.

Pinky Kushner suggested that the shuttle traverse the entire perimeter of the park, while inside the park there could be a system of jitneys, bicycle rental places and other such services in the belief that jitneys are sexier than shuttles.

Laura Spanjian, Assistant to the Director at MUNI, reported on a recent meeting with the Duffey Company. She reported that MUNI is very excited about the intrapark shuttle. This is something that they have wanted to do for years, but have never had the resources. Ms. Spanjian expressed that MUNI would review any proposal that is brought forward. She recommended going outside of the park to in order to connect with the N-Judah at 9th and Irving.

Howard Strassner emphasized the importance of working with MUNI and suggested expanding the "44 line."

Philip Carleton asked if the cost of the signage is figured into the operational costs and if the employers or vendors who get the bid will be paying union wages. He also expressed concern for the overall project if the economy were to take a turn for the worse.

CEO Ellzey responded that it has been his experience that the cost of the signage in any sort of operation is included in its operational costs. Regarding the issue of wages, that will be dealt with in due course.

Tom Harriman from the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition discouraged the use of the shuttle on JFK Drive during Sunday closure and believes that it would set a bad precedent.

Marilyn Duffey then reported on the Duffey Company's findings resulting from three, two-hour workshops on the topic of a cultural shuttle. Ms. Duffey highlighted the portion of Proposition J that does call for the development of a cultural shuttle. It states specifically that the shuttle should carry visitors from downtown transit locations to and from the park in order to reduce automobile traffic within the park and encourage public access. Therefore, the two main things are to reduce the use of automobiles and to have greater access to the park. This proposed certain implications for the routes that were to be considered and it led the Authority to look at transit links as the major stops. Increasing public access to the park is the other main topic that was considered as part of this study. She reported that both MUNI and the cultural shuttle working group discussed the fact that this shuttle might be in competition with existing MUNI service. This realization led us to develop an alternative to the concept that was delivered to you in your packet. In subsequent discussions with MUNI, the alternative is for the Concourse Authority to work with MUNI very closely and cooperatively and through marketing programs, enhance the service that MUNI already provides in order to improve access to the park and then link with our intrapark shuttle. The important thing is that the MUNI lines could be improved and the first way to improve MUNI is to have MUNI be more dependable. Another way is to increase frequency during special events in the park.

Ms. Duffey went on to describe different concepts for the shuttle and its suggested routes. In the end, however, the route that will best work may come out of an RFP process where persons or vendors who provide the service would provide the best ideas. She then went through some of the general design parameters that were defined by the working group. For example,

- Use of zero emission vehicles
- Small vehicle with a special look
- ADA compliant
- Equipped with bicycle racks

The initial carrying capacity should be at least 1000-5000 riders a day. It was recommended that a limited pilot program be implemented initially so that you start small and build on the success without an exorbitant operating cost. She emphasized that the service is not a commuter service and although it would connect with all the major transit links, it is meant specifically for park visitors. Finally, before starting it was recommended that we conduct focus groups to survey park visitors in order to see whether or not there is an interest in a shuttle like this. A shuttle such as this could be very successful as it has been in other places in the United States, and there are many who run these shuttles who are very interested in working with the Authority and helping the program get started.

President Conner added that over time the cultural shuttle concept has become a regional transit concept.

Ms. Duffey responded that the concept is to try to connect with the largest number of persons who visit the park on a regular basis. The visitor data shows that they are from the Bay Area counties. Our intent is a 'transit first' approach in which we encourage the use of public transportation into the City and a shuttle to take them directly into the park.

CEO Ellzey added that such partnerships might also provide additional funding opportunities as well.

Director Lum asked if the cultural shuttle would provide service to just the park or to additional downtown cultural institutions as well.

Ms. Duffey replied that the working group started out by including Golden Gate Park as just one of a number of attractions within the City. But it was the consensus of the working group that such a broad concept was attempting to do too much. Since the mandate of Proposition J is to provide better transit access to the Park, we therefore limited our scope to the Park. If the shuttle were a success in connecting with the transit links, then it could be expanded to also serve other attractions, for example the Exploratorium, the Palace of the Legion of Honor, the Golden Gate Bridge and others. However, it was the consensus of the group to start with connecting the transit links and bring people directly to the park as efficiently as possible.

Laura Spanjian commented on MUNI's perception on a cultural shuttle to Golden Gate Park. She said that the concept was a little more difficult for MUNI to embrace. She informed the commission that Michael Burns, MUNI's General Manager, had just come from Philadelphia where they tried to do something very similar and it failed. The premise is to encourage visitors to take transit instead of driving to the park in which case a shuttle to the park will pick them up from a transfer point. This is a concern to MUNI because it completes with their service and it might be better to improve the existing service instead of creating a new one. Why not market MUNI as a viable option for getting to the park? And though there is a mandate in Proposition J for a cultural shuttle and there might be a need for one, Ms. Spanjian doesn't necessarily agree with the current plan. It definitely needs to be reviewed.

CEO Ellzey added that partnering directly with MUNI on the shuttle is pretty fascinating. It seems that the lead-time on implementing such a program could be reduced by years. What is being talked about is a comprehensive service review and then a PR and marketing campaign. One way or another the Authority wants MUNI to be involved with this concept of a cultural shuttle.

Pinky Kushner commented about the severe grade on 17th Street and has concerns about a shuttle going on Parnassus Street as transit vehicles already overrun it. The vehicles already block traffic around the hospital and she feels as though having another shuttle might jeopardize public safety. Additionally, there already exists a route from the Ferry Building to the Park and that is the N-Judah. She advocates MUNI's extension of a G-Line.

Howard Strassner commented on the shuttle plan and that it is his belief that the best use of funds would be to enhance MUNI service. A marketing and PR campaign for taking MUNI to the Park seems to be the most viable choice.

Philip Carleton remarked that he was a little disturbed that people who go to the Board meetings on a regular basis were not part of the cultural shuttle working group.

**PRESENTATION BY THE STRYBING ARBORETUM AND BOTANICAL GARDENS (SAN FRANCISCO RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT).**

Scot Medbury, Director of the Arboretum introduced the Strybing's organization, programs and plans, and discussed the Strybing's interest in collaborating with the Concourse Authority in the construction of the underground parking facility and the development of surface, roadway and traffic improvements in the music Concourse and the remainder of the Park.

Mr. Medbury gave an overview of the Strybing arboretum and its programs. Strybing has one of the oldest, most diverse and largest collections of plants in the Western Hemisphere and is consistently ranked as one of the most important botanical gardens in the world. He spoke about site planning and the history of developing the arboretum and how important transportation planning, specifically automobile parking, has been in creating the arboretum that we have today.

Mr. Medbury reported on a couple key points that relate to the construction of a parking garage. Regarding the Wilbur Smith study and the on-street parking along MLK Drive that borders the arboretum, there are a lot of flexible planning in the arboretum and the County Fair Building is heavily booked throughout the year. The concern is the elimination of on-street parking and that the garage hours would not be flexible enough to accommodate the arboretum's schedule.

Losing this on-street parking, which services the users at all hours, might be adding to the inconvenience of using the arboretum and the County Fair Building.

The second concern relates to the garage itself and pedestrian egress. Under to so-called two-pod scheme that had emerged from the Bechtel study, it was noted that if you had these large pod garages, pedestrian egress to the open air was only suggested directly into the Concourse itself. If one had parked at the South end of the garage, one would have to walk back to the center to exit and then walk a long way to get into the gates of the arboretum. Mr. Medbury encouraged the Authority to consider providing for pedestrian egress at the south end of the pods if possible.

CEO Ellzey thanked Mr. Medbury and assured him of the organization's continued involvement and collaboration, particularly as it relates to construction schedules and the parking and transportation effort.

**DIRECTORS' BUSINESS.**

This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time.

Director Rizzo wanted to see updates of the project's schedule.

CEO Ellzey responded that the project schedule would be coming forward in February along with an entire review for the Board under the 90-day agreements. These would be primarily a design alternative review, community relations, public involvement outreach planning and the project schedule.

Director Haygood added that she would like to see project updates on every agenda along with budget and financials both having to do with construction and the operation of staff. Also, she would like to have some discussion of the issues revolving around the MOU with RecPark and how we plan to move forward.

President Conner asked what this Board's involvement in the MOU process should be.

CEO Ellzey replied that the MOU, as it is currently being developed, is an agreement involving the RecPark Department, the Music Concourse and Garage Fund (MCGF), a project of the Community Initiative Fund, which is a 501c3 subset to the SF Foundation. MCGF is the philanthropic organization that is making the pitch for the fund-raising effort, and is acting as a depository of the funds. They are indirectly a part of the SF Foundation. Naturally, as a party to the MOU, the MOU would come to the Authority for discussion and Board approval.

Director Haygood would like some discussion to understand how that action dovetails off of the 90-day contracts that we currently have and how those two activities work together.

CEO Ellzey added that we hope to coordinate the timing so that the MOU is ready for presentation prior to any long-term agreements that would be recommended to the Board. The 90-day agreements would better define some of the terms and conditions that would be part of the MOU and help us better understand the long-term relationship.

**PUBLIC COMMENT.**

Philip Carleton asked that the public be alerted about the MOU well ahead of time.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25pm.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
FEB 13 2001
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, February 13, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 9, 2000 **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
The Board President will recognize the contributions of a member of the community and park user **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

Project Overview. The CEO will provide an update of consultant activities under the 90-day scoping agreements, including the environmental review process and the planned near- and longer-term community relations and public involvement program.

Review of Quarterly Report for Fourth Quarter 2000. CEO will summarize the quarterly report of the activities of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority during the fourth quarter of 2000.

Review of Concourse Authority's Operations and Project Budgets as of January 31, 2001. The CEO will review the current status as of the end of January 2001 of both the Authority's operating budget and the budget associated with the Authority's project work.

5. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ACCEPT THE FEASIBILITY STUDY DEVELOPED BY WILBUR SMITH ASSOCIATES AND THE DUFFEY COMPANY UNDER A CONTRACT EXECUTED WITH WILBUR SMITH ASSOCIATES THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKING AND TRAFFIC.** Representatives of Wilbur Smith and The Duffey Company will present the feasibility study to the Authority, as contemplated under Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998. **(ACTION ITEM)**

6. **PRESENTATION BY GORDON H. CHONG & PARTNERS ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN EVALUATION OF THE UNDERGROUND PARKING FACILITY TO BE LOCATED IN THE MUSIC CONCOURSE AREA OF GOLDEN GATE PARK, AS CONTEMPLATED BY THE GOLDEN GATE PARK REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1998.** A representative of Gordon H. Chong & Partners, master architects under contract to the Concourse Authority, will present the results of its preliminary design evaluation of the underground parking facility. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

7. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**

This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2085. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force at 415-554-6083.

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2085

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

F
45
2
2/13/01

# FINAL MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 13, 2001 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on February 13, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

**ROLL CALL:**

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, Tammy Haygood, Jim Lazarus, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan and John Rizzo. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY 0 8 2001
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the January meeting. The motion was seconded and the motion carried.

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT.**

President Conner recognized the contributions of park user and community member Chris Duderstadt in his tireless advocacy in representing recreational users and Golden Gate Park. The Authority commended Mr. Duderstadt for his website, *sfpix*, and his kind loan of some of the images from his archives for use.

President Conner announced the promotion of Michael Rice from EIP. Mr. Rice was recently appointed Deputy Regional Manager.

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:**

CEO Ellzey provided an update of consultant activities under the 90-day scoping agreements, including the environment review process and the planned near and longer-term community relations and public involvement program. He also provided a summary of the quarterly report of the activities of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority during the fourth quarter of 2000.

Mr. Ellzey reported that EIP has already completed substantial EIR work on behalf of the de Young Museum project and some preliminary work with the California Academy of Sciences. For the last couple of months they have also been working with the Concourse Authority attending a series of meetings with the project team.

As project advisor, MCK Associates have developed a coordinated schedule of the series of projects that are being conducted in the Concourse area. That schedule is available for public review and has been submitted to the board members and will be reviewed with the City Architect's office. MCK Associates have also been assisting in analyzing the alternative design plans for the garage.

The community relations program that is being managed by Public Affairs Management will be advertising and conducting a community meeting before the next board meeting for the purpose of soliciting community input on the intrapark shuttle and on the design alternatives for the garage.

At the April board meeting, it is expected that the CEO will be asking the Board of Directors to accept a preferred alternative based on the community input and his recommendations. Then the schematic design work and the EIR process can begin.

CEO Ellzey made it clear that the EIR work is not going on now, only early research and early development of the environmental evaluation application are included under the 90-day contract. The whole EIR process will be a six to twelve month process to begin sometime mid-year.

Director Rizzo recommended that there should be more public meetings held about transportation issues. CEO Ellzey replied that, including the regular meetings of the board, there would be a number of opportunities for the public to consider these issues while the consultants are under the 90-day agreements. We would clearly have several more community relations meetings subsequent to that related to the garage design.

President Conner added that the second meeting would be more inclusive to include transportation information as well as design issues.

A brief methodology for outreach that is typically used for such programs was presented. PAM will be doing a display ad and sending notices to the Authority's present mailing list as well as other lists gathered from the institutions, RecPark, and others. There will also be announcements in local newspapers and newsletters.

Director Haygood pointed out a discrepancy in the schedule relating to the EIR. CEO Ellzey explained that the schedule simply connotes the beginning of the evaluation work and that the whole process is 262 days.

CEO Ellzey recommended a change on the schedule that would better reflect the EIR process.

Director Haygood questioned the 90-day contracts in general. She had understood them to be scoping contracts in that each of the consultants were to develop a scope of work and a budget that would provide something from which to move forward in the development of an actual contract. However, it seems that actual project work is being done while the scope of work has not yet been defined.

CEO Ellzey replied that the deliverable under the 90-day scoping agreements is the refinement of the project budget and schedule, and early design and environmental evaluation.

Director Haygood then suggested another change on the schedule that would move the design and approval bar on the scale over to a later date. This would imply that there is a time to scope the contract and determine its guidelines, and then time to operate under that contract.

CEO Ellzey concurred and assured that the changes to the schedule would be made and the schedule redistributed. The design and approval clearly have not yet begun and would not begin as a deliverable under the scoping agreements. That would happen under the long-term contracts.

Director Haygood added that the commissioners should be involved in public outreach, the EIR, and any other process that takes place subsequent to the scoping agreements.

Director Rizzo asked how the consultants would be funded after the 90-day period ends. CEO Ellzey replied that that is the subject of on-going discussion between the funders, RecPark and the Concourse Authority. The source of the funds is known, but it is uncertain as to the flow of those funds.

CEO Ellzey then reviewed the Concourse Authority's Operations and Project Budgets as of January 31, 2001. He reviewed the current status as of the end of January 2001 of both the Authority's operating budget and the budget associated with the Authority's project work. There was some discussion to clarify various entries to the budget relating to contracts, salaries and the management of the public and private funds.

Pinky Kushner from the Inner-Sunset Park Neighbors would like to tell her board whether or not there are going to be any more meetings besides the two regular public meetings. She was concerned that many public groups only meet once every month or two, there are those who live near the park would be very interested in what is going on. CEO Ellzey's reply was that there would be many public meetings in the years to come. Those that we are discussing today are purely a part of the 90-day scoping process.

Michael Smith asked whether the monies that Proposition J states would be spent on transit every year are included in the budget. CEO Ellzey replied that those funds are separate and would be used following the acceptance of the Golden Gate Park Transportation Feasibility Study at this meeting.

**Discussion and possible action item to accept the Feasibility Study developed by Wilbur Smith Associates and the Duffey Company under a contract executed with Wilbur Smith Associates through the Department of Parking and Traffic.** Luba Wyznyckyj of Wilbur Smith Associates and Marilyn Duffey of the Duffey Company presented the feasibility study to the Authority, as contemplated under Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998.

Ms. Duffey considers this project one of the more exciting projects in the City in that it offers some real opportunities for transportation. She stated that most of the actions in this study tier off of those the Golden Gate Park master plan and have been discussed and analyzed in the environmental document for the master plan. The Duffey Company has taken the actions in the master plan and carried them a step further. For the completion of the study being presented, there has been much input from many of city departments such as DPT, MUNI, the Transportation Authority, the Fine Arts Museums, the Academy of Sciences, RecPark and many transportation interest groups.

Ms. Duffey gave an overview of the recommended actions for implementation of the intrapark and cultural shuttles and reminded everyone that this is a feasibility study and the proposed actions are meant for public input and consideration. The Feasibility Study will be available to the public by contacting Julia Kay or Mike Ellzey at the Concourse Authority and will also be put on the website and be available to the public through the website.

Ms. Wyznyckyj then reported on four of the remaining sections in the study: traffic calming, parking and bicycle improvements, and road closures. She reviewed the items as laid out in the Golden Gate Park Master Plan and the recommended short-term and long-term actions for the Concourse Authority as related to those items.

Regarding traffic calming, actions for the short-term include continued coordination with RecPark in the implementation of the master plan and its actions, coordination of the JFK landscaping and bicycle lane improvements and the incorporation of the work on the

Concourse and the pedestrian circulation along with the garage. Another short-term action is to consider re-striping on JFK and MLK Drives in the vicinity of the Concourse in order to delineate the bicycle lanes, the parking lanes, the left turn pockets, and make the crosswalks more visible.

Actions for the long-term include—after the garage is completed and the circulation improvements are made—the monitoring of traffic volumes and traffic speed and to identify additional measures that might be feasible in order to have traffic calmed. Also, it is important to continue to have feedback from the public on the effectiveness of these traffic-calming measures.

Actions for parking include a recommendation for a comprehensive mapping of the park in order to better identify parking availability and the utilization of the park, community workshops in order to review potential locations for the removal of parking spaces within the park, and coordination with RecPark to integrate a parking management plan.

For bicycle networking conditions within the park, there where two influences that drove the study; the San Francisco Bicycle Plan prepared by DPT and approved in 1998, and the Golden Gate Park Master Plan. Actions to support the master plan and the bicycle plan include collecting information on the bicycle use in the park during weekdays and weekends, collecting information on vehicle travel speeds providing an understanding of what bicyclists experience while in the park, and coordination with RecPark, DPT and the Bicycle Coalition on these issues—particularly as they relate to the Concourse and the establishment of bicycle-only paths in the park.

Actions regarding road closures include the coordination with RecPark to make sure that the road closures identified in the Master Plan do not conflict with the improvements that have been identified in the feasibility study (in particular the intrapark shuttle), and an analysis of the effect of closing JFK on Saturdays.

Ms. Duffey remarked on the Duffey Company's findings regarding the use of nearby garages, and MUNI improvements to and within the park. She then invited input from the public at the upcoming community workshop in March.

There was some discussion about the differences between the two maps in the parking study. Ms. Duffey recommended that the logic behind the RecPark map and the Wilbur Smith map be examined and allow the community and park users to state their opinions before there is any finalized plan. CEO Ellzey asked that the comments received from the community be considered as the evaluation continues.

There was a brief discussion about the traffic calming issue. President Conner reported that she has had regular communication with the planning department of RecPark regarding landscape improvements and that they are working in tandem with the Concourse Authority on any forward movement. Ms. Duffey suggested that a group similar to the working group for the cultural shuttle be put together for the purpose of traffic calming and parking issues. The group could include representatives from RecPark, DPT, and neighborhood groups. That process proved very successful.

Director Rizzo asked about the process of getting the intrapark shuttle up and running by next summer. Ms. Duffey suggested that the Authority put together an RFP within the next two months to allow optimal opportunity for response.

There was much discussion regarding the board's acceptance of the Transportation Feasibility Study as there was initial confusion as to whether the Board was approving the recommended action items or implementation plans contained within the study. CEO Ellzey made it clear that the acceptance of this study is the acceptance of a deliverable work product contracted for some months ago and reviewed by the Board over the past six months. This Board's acceptance of the study in no way is meant to be the approval for the implementation of the recommended actions.

Greg Stinson, read a statement from Dick Tilles of the Presidio Trust regarding this item and is summarized as follows:

The Presidio Trust strongly supports all efforts to reduce auto traffic in both parks (the Presidio and Golden Gate Park) and the development of a cultural shuttle and wants to insure that the Presidio is included along its route. The Presidio Trust is currently updating its master plan and is looking towards greatly increasing the number of cultural activities in the Presidio. The Presidio is currently interviewing potential operators of an intrapark shuttle and expects to begin service this spring and he would like to share their experiences with the Authority and see if buses could be shared.

Marsha G. Harris commented that due to heavy congestion and numerous bus lines, to have anymore shuttles on Parnassus Street is a bad idea. She also expressed her concern about the retention of the trees in the Music Concourse area during construction.

Chris Duderstadt and Pinky Kushner were concerned that there is very little quantitative information about park usage in the Transportation Feasibility Study, especially regarding parking space removal and the number of spaces needed for the garage.

Jon Winston and Maryanne Miller were concerned that the 1000 parking spaces taken away and replaced by the parking spaces in the garage in accordance with Proposition J, need to be from the eastern end of the park only. Those spaces removed from the western end of the park for safety and other issues should not be counted towards that end.

Maryanne Miller commented further that she believes that acceptance of the Transportation Feasibility Study at this meeting may be misconstrued later as if there were an acceptance of the recommended actions. She also felt that some of the public workshop should be combined in order that the Authority not exhaust the public.

Howard Strassner from the Sierra Club echoed some of the previous comments and stated that this report needs more numbers. He also has concerns regarding counting parking spaces as part of our project that are already being removed as part of the Golden Gate Park Master Plan. Furthermore, he would like to see some indication of what happens if only a small garage was needed. He went on to promote the Sierra Club plan for a pedestrian oasis in the Concourse and would like to see that as an option in the Study.

In response to the comments regarding the lack of numbers in the report, Ms. Wyznyckyj reported that there were numbers that did not make it into the final report and those will be put back in.

Michael Nurre commented that the Authority needs to have less a wish list and more a vision of what it is trying to accomplish.

There being no further comment on this item, President Conner asked for a motion to acknowledge the receipt of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Transportation Feasibility Study.

The motion was made and it was RESOLVED that the Authority acknowledges the receipt of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Transportation Feasibility Study by Wilbur Smith and Associates and the Duffey Company.

Subsequently a motion was made that the Authority begin to develop an implementation plan for the intrapark shuttle project. It was RESOLVED that the Authority direct the CEO to start the implementation of the intrapark shuttle project and have it underway by the summer of 2001.

**PRESENTATION BY GORDON H. CHONG & PARTNERS ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN EVALUATION OF THE UNDERGROUND PARKING FACILITY TO BE LOCATED IN THE MUSIC CONCOURSE AREA OF GOLDEN GATE PARK, AS CONTAMPLATED BY THE GOLDEN GATE REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1998.** Geoff Adams, Principal and Project Manager of Gordon Chong & Partners, master architects under contract to the Concourse Authority presented the results of its preliminary design evaluation of the underground parking facility.

Mr. Adams presented three alternative designs for viewing by the Authority and the public. He reported that these approaches to the designs are based on meetings with RecPark, the de Young Museum, the California Academy of Sciences as well as evaluation of the requirements of Proposition J and of the site. The primary issue according to Proposition J is to look at the garage from the standpoint of garage capacity, function and efficiency. The second issue is access to garage. The proposition mandates that an access be provided from outside the park. The third issue relates to pedestrian circulation. Next, the items for consideration are the surface improvements and the restoration of the Concourse and how that would relate to each of the three approaches. Lastly, there are construction issues involved due to the fact that there will be three separate construction projects going on simultaneously in the area of the Concourse.

Mr. Adams briefly discussed each scheme and highlighted the differences between the approaches from the standpoint of garage function and level of service as well as the items mentioned above.

Regarding the Sierra Club plan for a 'car-free' Concourse, there will have to be a decision made as to whether or not the area would be open for drop-off and pick-up in front of the museums or closed entirely except for emergency vehicles. In any event, the three approaches to the garage do not preclude the Sierra Club plan.

Mr. Adams reported on the significance of the Music Concourse as a historic site and said all of the elements in the area have to be restored to their current configuration. Any alterations to the surface would need to be approved by RecPark and the state historic preservation office as part of the EIR as well as the community.

CEO Ellzey added that after reviewing these alternatives, RecPark recognized the fact, and it is their opinion, that these or any variation of these alternatives ultimately will have significant impact to the Concourse area. It is their view that this is an opportunity to invite programming considerations as well as restore and revitalize the Concourse area in its present state and looks forward to close coordination with the Concourse Authority to revitalize the central Concourse area.

Mr. Ellzey also wanted the Board to understand that costing associated with the alternatives will be developed over the next several months. Chong & Partners is currently working with

the cost estimator, a world-renowned local firm, who is assisting the Authority in developing some cost parameters.

Mr. Adams added that the three alternatives have been reviewed with representatives from RecPark and the two institutions as well as the City Planning Department and their meetings have brought about more potential alternatives. He then invited comments from the Board and the public.

There was some discussion about the process of choosing the final design and what happens now that those three alternatives have been identified. Mr. Adams reported that ultimately schemes would be eliminated, although right now the alternatives are growing. This will be done through public meetings and then an attempt will be made to fix the scope of the process. It may be that we will continue to evaluate one or two alternatives in more detail and he suspects that that will be the case as we begin the EIR process.

When asked which of the three alternatives he preferred, Mr. Adams conceded that the single-level alternative would be his choice if the decision were to be made purely from a design standpoint. However, there are simply too many issues at stake, mainly the surface of the Concourse itself.

Howard Strassner encouraged serious consideration of the Sierra Club Plan and wanted Chong & Partners to be sure to include it while doing cost estimation.

Maryanne Miller requested that for presentation at the community meetings, the design alternatives be shown in 3-d for ease of understanding. She also suggested that the plan include an interpretation of pedestrian circulation and how it differ from the circulation of automobiles in order to understand how people will move through the space. Additionally, Ms. Miller has concerns about the historic preservation of the Music Concourse.

Greg Gaar, representing the Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC), questioned pedestrian access to the Concourse. It is his belief that it is crucial for pedestrians who are not accessing the garage be allowed easy access to the Concourse without having to cross roadways. In his opinion, if the public had seen any of these proposals when Proposition J was placed on the ballot, it would have been soundly defeated.

Chris Duderstadt asked that his proposal for a garage design be considered. He stated that the three alternative presented would not improve the park and asked that the consultants consider an alternative of using the space around the de Young Museum.

Phil Carleton brought copies of campaign literature in support of Proposition J that stated that the proposed parking facility would be built under existing roadways and preserves and renews the Music Concourse, which will not be torn up as part of construction.

Michael Nurre agreed with the previous comments and stated that he doesn't believe that the current project properly represents what Proposition J initially proposed.

**DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**. This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings.

Director Rizzo asked that the Board Members keep better informed about the issues that surround the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. He suggested that attending an occasional planning meeting could easily do this.

Tammy Haygood reminded that there was a time when each board member was assigned and volunteered for different functions. She would like to see a re-affirmation of these functions and the process reviewed so that there is more participation from the board.

At the next meeting Director Rizzo would like to have discussion about the proposed website. He also would like to have business cards.

Director MacColl asked about term limits and the election of officers.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**: At this time members of the public address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority that did not appear on the agenda.

Philip Carleton asked that the Authority check with the Richmond and Park Station police for reports that monitor the speed of the traffic through Golden Gate Park in order to understand better the need for traffic calming.

Greg Gaar has concerns that these proceedings are designed by and for only the wealthy and has nothing to do with the working class. As a native of San Francisco, he feels a family connection to Golden Gate Park. He suggested reading Ray Clary's book *the Making of Golden Gate Park* in order to get a better idea of the kind of politics that have plagued the park throughout its history. Furthermore, it was his contention that after RecPark employ three and four hour parking restrictions in the park, there will be no need for a garage. Lastly, he recommended that the public meetings be held at the County Fair Building in order to make it convenient for those communities that would be affected directly by the impact of a garage.

**ADJOURNMENT**: There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

AS
F
45
1
1/13/01

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, March 13, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAR 1 2 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 13, 2001 **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

**Project Overview**. The CEO will provide an update of consultant activities under the 90-day scoping agreements, including the environmental review process and the planned near- and longer-term community relations and public involvement program.

4. **PRESENTATION BY PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT ON THE COMMUNITY WORKSHOP CONVENED BY THE CONCOURSE AUTHORITY ON MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2001.** Representatives of Public Affairs Management will summarize the proceedings of the community workshop convened on Monday night, March 12th for the purpose of discussing the Golden Gate Park Concourse Transportation Feasibility Study and the intra-park shuttle project to be developed by the Concourse Authority as contemplated by the Transportation Feasibility Study. Concourse Authority plans for three (3) additional community workshops will also be discussed. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **PRESENTATION BY GORDON H. CHONG & PARTNERS ON PRELIMINARY DESIGN EVALUATION OF THE UNDERGROUND PARKING FACILITY TO BE LOCATED IN THE MUSIC CONCOURSE AREA OF GOLDEN GATE PARK, AS CONTEMPLATED BY THE GOLDEN GATE PARK REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1998.** A representative of Gordon H. Chong & Partners, master architects under contract to the Concourse Authority, will present a fourth design alternative for the underground parking facility, developed by the architect as a result of public input received at the February Concourse Authority Board Meeting. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **AUTHORIZE EXTENSION OF 90-DAY "PROJECT SCOPING" AGREEMENTS WITH SELECTED CONSULTANTS FOR AN ADDITIONAL 120 DAYS TO COMPLETE THE CONCEPTUAL DESIGN PHASE OF THE PROJECT.** The CEO will request that the Board of Directors authorize, subject to availability of funds and the approval of the parties to the current 90-day agreements, an extension of each consulting agreement for an additional 120 days to complete the conceptual design phase of the project. The additional funding required for these extensions shall not exceed $335,000. The aggregate amount for the "project scoping" and "conceptual design" phases of the project shall not exceed $445,000. **(ACTION ITEM)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

7. **AUTHORIZE AN AGREEMENT WITH THE DUFFEY COMPANY TO COMPLETE IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING FOR THE INTRA-PARK SHUTTLE PROJECT.** The CEO will request that the Board of Directors authorize, subject to availability of funds, an agreement with The Duffey Company to complete implementation planning for the intra-park shuttle project as contemplated in the Golden Gate Park Concourse Transportation Feasibility Study. The aggregate amount for this implementation planning agreement shall not exceed $23,900. **(ACTION ITEM)**

8. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

# FINAL MINUTES OF THE MARCH 13, 2001 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on March 13, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 0 8 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**ROLL CALL:**

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, Tammy Haygood, Jim Lazarus, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, and John Rizzo. Margaret O'Sullivan was absent. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:**

There were some corrections to the Minutes of the previous meeting. On page two, third paragraph, the first sentence should read that "Director Rizzo recommended that there should be more public meetings held about the garage design." The other correction is on page five, first paragraph. It was agreed to delete the last sentence to more adequately reflect the spirit of the discussion.

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the February meeting and it was **RESOLVED** to approve the amended minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 13, 2001.

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:** CEO Ellzey provided ~~a~~ an update of consultant activities under the 90-day scoping agreements, including the environmental review process and the planned near and longer term community relations and public involvement program.

CEO Ellzey brought the board up to date on the progress of each of the four consultants under the 90-day agreements. Gordon H. Chong & Partners have spent considerable time developing a better understanding of the garage project and defining preliminary parameters; particularly as it relates to access issues and costing factors. The firm has studied the limitations of the proposition, and has come up with a preliminary range of alternatives for the garage design. Many of the conceptual design alternatives are based on public input as well as input from some of the stakeholder groups in an on-going and open-ended discussion.

MCK Associates has taken a leadership role in establishing a construction coordination process and a design coordination process. It conducts monthly coordination, utilities, and design meetings for the purpose of better understanding our boundaries and the schedules of the adjacent projects. MCK Associates has outlined a project schedule for all the projects and are working closely with respective project managers. In addition, it has brought a valuable expertise to the constructablility issues that are going to arise and affect costing. MCK Associates has begun to work with some community groups, and when the subcontracting work begins MCK Associates will assist in administering the minority participation programs.

EIP Associates has not had an opportunity to proceed substantially on the project, primarily because it is premature for them to launch their pre-EIR effort or accomplish the environmental evaluation application. This won't take place until there is a preferred design alternative, which is expected to be selected within the next 120 days. Therefore, EIP Associates has only expended about $7,000 of their $37,500 not to exceed amount from their original 90-day contract.

Lastly, Public Affairs Management (PAM) has done an outstanding job in beginning the work for a coordinated public involvement program. PAM managed the process for last night's community

workshop that was facilitated by Mr. Iacofano from MIG. The Authority's website has not yet been established, but draft material has been provided to staff for review. It is expected that the website will be up in early April. Public Affairs Management is continually working with staff to develop a detailed work plan for the remaining phases of our community outreach program

.

CEO Ellzey is pleased with the progress that has been made in the last 90 days. He said that it has become evident that we have an outstanding team working on our behalf on this project.

There were some requests from the board for clarification of the dates of the 90-day contracts and the expenditures thus far against the not-to-exceed amounts. CEO Ellzey replied that the dates in which those contracts expired range from March 4 to March 12. He then reviewed the numbers from the most recent accounting from February 25. That accounting is as follows:

| Consultant | Not-to-exceed Amount | Billed as of February 25 |
|---|---|---|
| Gordon H. Chong & Partners | $30,000 | $25,028 |
| MCK Associates | $12,500 | $11,857 |
| EIP Associates | $37,500 | $ 7,500 |
| Public Affairs Management | $30,000 | $25,470 |

That total is around $70,000 and it is expected that there will another $25,000 expended for work that has been preformed as of the final accounting.

There was much discussion in an attempt to understand the budget and costing effort to date as it relates to the overall project and the prime contractors. It seems as though there is work being done now that has gone beyond the scope of the original 90-day contracts and without having come up with fixed-fee contracts. CEO Ellzey explained that the original intent of the 90-day contracts was to get an idea of the overall project. However, as efforts are made towards that end, it becomes more difficult to accurately define the broad parameters of the project. In particular, it is difficult to define the access issues and it is not known at this point what kinds of funding opportunities will be available. As the project moves along, there will be a better understanding for a true project budget. However, without an understanding of the total funds that will be available, it is difficult to define the true project budget or a true project scope. There are too many unanswered questions at this point.

There was general concern regarding the "piecemeal" approach to executing agreements among the prime contractors. CEO Ellzey agreed that this is not the best way to approach the project. He said that while the MOU is being developed, this is the only way for the project to move forward. It is expected that by the conclusion of the 120-day extensions, many of these questions will be answered and built into the terms of the MOU, including the long-term contract scope and budget.

Director Lazarus urged the staff to work on the long-term contracts as though we had a master agreement so that they will be ready to sign when the MOU is executed. Although the funding provisions of those contracts would be somewhat open to final determination, we will have already moved forward.

Chris Duderstadt had concerns that we had chosen the project architect without there being a quoting process. CEO Ellzey stated that there has been no selection made of any final consultants.

**Presentation by Public Affairs Management on the Community Workshop Convened by the Concourse Authority on Monday, March 12.** Kay Wilson of Public Affairs Management summarized the proceedings of the community workshop convened on Monday night, March 12th for the purpose of discussing the Golden Gate Park Concourse Transportation Feasibility Study and the intra-park shuttle project to be developed by the Concourse Authority as contemplated by the

Transportation Feasibility Study. The Concourse Authority plans for three additional community workshops on April 3rd, May 1st, and May 30th for the specific purpose of reviewing Proposition J objectives and the design alternatives developed by Gordon H. Chong & Partners.

Ms. Wilson began by thanking the commissioners, all of whom attended the workshop. She then gave a brief summary on the workshop that was held at the County Fair Building in Golden Gate Park. The park has a lot of interest and so does the proposed parking garage. Public Affairs Management was very pleased with the attendance and the outcome of the meeting. The purpose of last night's meeting was to receive comments on the intra-park shuttle. Ms. Wilson then summarized the public's comments that were received on the shuttle as well as some of those who spoke regarding the parking garage.

At the workshop, there were a number of comments of the importance of Proposition J and its original intention to reduce the use of automobiles in the park. Other comments were made on the importance of using private funds and not public money. There were several comments about the importance of tree preservation and the overall preservation and character of the existing Music Concourse. Several parties acknowledged that there is the need for compromise and working together not only on the garage solutions, but the traffic management plan for the park.

The next three workshops will focus on the garage and be the main focus on our community relations program for many months to come. Director Rizzo suggested holding the meetings in several different neighborhoods to collect a diversity of opinions. There were additional suggestions from the Board and the public to involve the Hispanic and Asian communities as well as a wide range of neighborhoods that represent San Francisco.

Director Lum had concerns about the outreach and would like to see more people of color at the workshops as well as a broader group from around the region. Director MacColl suggested that the meetings be noticed with the merchants in the neighborhoods.

It was generally agreed that the first community workshop was well attended and well organized and that a lot of people are dedicated to the park. CEO Ellzey reported that at future workshops we would work to ensure that we mail bilingual announcements and reach out to more neighborhood groups. The next workshops will be in other areas around the city.

Howard Strassner of the Sierra Club, agreed that the meeting was successful and encouraged the consultants to work together in order to create more interconnectedness among each element of the project and Proposition J.

Katherine Roberts had the impression from the meeting last night that most people were in opposition to the garage and urged the Authority to adhere to the spirit of Proposition J in that there be no use of public funds and no damage to the Music Concourse.

Tomasita Medál commented that the Authority lacks multicultural representation. She encouraged that the next workshop be held in outlying areas in order to have better diversification.

.

**Presentation by Gordon H. Chong & Partners on Preliminary Design Evaluation of the Underground Parking Facility to be Located in the Music Concourse Area of Golden Gate Park, as Contemplated by the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998.** Gordon Chong from Gordon H. Chong & Partners, master architects under contract to the Concourse Authority, presented a fourth design alternative for the underground parking facility, developed by the architect as a result of public input received at the February Concourse Authority Board Meeting. Mr. Chong reported on and reiterated the CEO's summary of the project updates in order to clarify further the design goals for the current phase of the work. Mr. Chong made it very clear that, to

date, Gordon H. Chong & Partners have undertaken no design work and are currently undertaking conceptual design work in order to help the Authority come to a decision of a preferred direction.

Mr. Chong reported that as the public process continues, there might be more concepts that will need to be explored. Currently, Gordon H. Chong & Partners has been asked to analyze a proposal conceived by Chris Duderstadt. The overall idea behind the current phase of the project is to identify the pros and cons of the various alternatives. The design work cannot begin until everyone is comfortable with a design direction. Mr. Chong then went on to present the forth schematic design alternative.

There was some concern about the number of trees that the forth alternative design might impact and many were concerned for the bandshell.

**Authorize extension of 90-day "Project Scoping" Agreements with Selected consultants for an Additional 120 Days to Complete the Conceptual Design Phase of the Project.** CEO Ellzey requested that the Board of Directors authorize, subject to availability of funds and the approval of the parties to the current 90-day agreements, an extension of each consulting agreement for an additional 120 days to complete the conceptual design phase of the project. The additional funding required for these extensions shall not exceed $335,000. The aggregate amount for the "project scoping" and "conceptual design" phases of the project shall not exceed $445,000.

It is expected that the pending MOU would supplant these 120-day contracts in favor of a long-term project agreement. However, until the MOU is completed and longer-term contracts are signed, CEO Ellzey recommended to the board that this is the most prudent approach. This will allow the consultants to continue their work. Mr. Ellzey then invited consultants to speak to the 120-day scope of work.

Mr. Chong clarified for the board that the scope of work would need to be changed in order to reflect the fifth alternative of Chris Duderstadt. It is important that any new scheme be strongly differentiated from the first four, otherwise the schematic phase could go on indefinitely. Further clarification included a brief description of the design process with emphasis on comparative analysis.

Director Haygood wanted clarification regarding the sub-contract to the Duffey Company and wanted to be sure that the work is not overlapping with its contract with the Authority. Mr. Chong replied that the Duffey Company sub-contract is not substantial and hopes to utilize their expertise in terms of looking at circulation patterns of the design alternatives.

Regarding the costing issue, Mr. Chong reported that it is difficult to know at this point. However, in the next 120 days, when it is expected that there will be a preferred scheme, the major costing considerations will be better known. It was agreed that it would be better to have the costing issues resolved sooner than later.

Ms. Wilson from PAM spent a few minutes on the public involvement component of the 120-day extension. In short, this would allow the public involvement program to continue at a full pace, primarily to get the community input on the three upcoming workshops that have already been announced and discussed. They will also be conducting up to fifty stakeholder interviews and doing a lot of coordination with the architects as well as other city offices that are involved in the project. They will be finishing the basic project information site for the web and expanding it to include the information on the workshops and the public's comments. There will be an opportunity on the site to accommodate interactive public comment with the website work contemplated in this next phase.

Director Lum asked how Public Affairs Management was going to address the concerns of diversification in terms of outreach to various interest groups and Director Haygood inquired as to the effectiveness of advertisement. Ms. Wilson responded that PAM is currently working towards broadening the mailing list to include key neighborhood and interest groups throughout the city. She explained that advertisements are quite expensive and so far PAM has had much success with media releases and creating interest for cover stories in local papers about the project.

Mary Anne Miller, Michael Nurre and Howard Strassner asked that the Authority go back to Proposition J and try to get a final vision of what this pedestrian oasis and Music Concourse will look like when everything is done. Every aspect of the proposition should be taken into consideration and all of the extremes need to be looked at. It was suggested that this issue be taken up in the next community workshop. Howard Strassner would also like to see more time spent with the Sierra Club plan in making those determinations.

Michael Nurre and Marty Hokans were concerned that the garage would only encourage more cars in the Music Concourse and he would like to hear more about the policies that would govern the garage and surface parking once the garage is finished.

Tomasita Medál commented that she would like to hear more input from those who have some experience with the trees and the landscape in the park.

There being no further discussion, a motion was made to authorize the extension of the 90-day contracts. The motion was seconded and it was **RESOLVED** that the board authorize the CEO to enter into discussion with the funders with the goal of extending the current 90-day project scoping agreements by an additional 120 days.

**Discussion and Possible Action Item to Authorize an Agreement with the Duffey Company to Complete Implementation Planning for the Intra-park Shuttle Project.** The CEO Ellzey requested that the Board of Directors authorize, subject to availability of funds, an agreement with the Duffey Company to complete implementation planning for the intra-park shuttle project as contemplated in the Golden Gate Park Concourse Transportation Feasibility Study. The aggregate amount for this implementation planning agreement shall not exceed $23,900.

CEO Ellzey reported that at the last board meeting when the feasibility study was presented to the board and the board acknowledged its receipt, he was directed by the board to pursue implementation of the intrapark shuttle the earliest practicable time. He the proceeded to ask for authorization to pursue an agreement with the private funders and the Duffey Company to provide the implementation planning necessary for the intrapark shuttle.

Director Haygood asked whether there have been discussions for the purpose of obtaining competitive bid for this work. CEO Ellzey explained that it would not make economic sense to conclude that the feasibility study and then pursue an implementation plan for the shuttle with any other than the same consultant. To date, there has already been some development work completed. This would continue the process.

Director Haygood reported that she had some open issues with the previous contract. She does not know for sure if the scope has been satisfied. And although those issues are not necessarily regarding the shuttle work, she is reluctant to move forward with another contract.

Director Lazarus asked for specifics regarding those issues. He is familiar with the work of the Duffey Company and hopes that whatever the issues are, they can be resolved in an upcoming

meeting among some directors and the consultant. President Conner added that the scope of the project was changed slightly as the project evolved to better reflect the language of the proposition.

Director Lum encouraged the board to accept this action, as it is the intent of the Authority to have the shuttle operational by summer.

There being no further comment, a motion was made to direct the CEO to seek the contracting authority through the funders to authorize an agreement with the Duffey Company. It was **RESOLVED** by a vote of 6-1, with Director Haygood voting "Against," to authorize the CEO to enter into discussions with the Duffey Company and the funders to complete the implementation planning phase of the intrapark shuttle project as contemplated in the Golden Gate Park Concourse Transportation Feasibility Study, in an amount not-to-exceed $23,900.

**Directors' Business.** This item allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items.

President Conner reported that Director MacColl has agreed to do the nominating process for our June meeting for the election of board officers. Director Rizzo, as Secretary, would like to see the minutes for review prior to distribution.

**Public Comment**

Tomasita Medál encouraged the use of a multi-lingual staff in order to avoid subcontracts for foreign language translations and outreach.

Jane Nurre would like to see numbers reflected in the minutes and wants to know of the progress regarding restricted parking in Golden Gate Park.

Chris Duderstadt left posters with staff of his parking studies for the records and for public viewing. He then read a brief sentence from William Hammond Hall, the first superintendent of Golden Gate Park; "Destroy a public building and it can be rebuilt in a year. Destroy a city woodland park, and all the people living at the time will have passed away before its restoration can be affected."

**ADJOURNMENT**: There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

SF
345
#1
4/10/01

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

APR - 9 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, April 10, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 13, 2001 **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

**Project Overview**. The CEO will provide an update of consultant activities, including the environmental review process and the planned near- and longer-term public involvement program.

4. **PRESENTATION BY PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT ON THE COMMUNITY WORKSHOP CONVENED BY THE CONCOURSE AUTHORITY ON TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 2001.** Representatives of Public Affairs Management will summarize the proceedings of the community workshop convened on April 3rd to discuss the objectives of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act of 1998 (Proposition J), specifically transit and traffic planning objectives and the range of design alternatives currently under evaluation. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **PRESENTATION BY RECREATION AND PARK ON THE STATUS OF THE PROJECT TO DESIGN AND CONSTRUCT IMPROVEMENTS TO AN INTERSECTION IN THE EASTERN END OF GOLDEN GATE PARK**. A representative of the Recreation and Park Department will update the Board on the status of improvements along JFK Drive between Stanyan Street and Kezar Drive. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **ACCEPTANCE OF GIFT IN KIND OF WORK COMPLETED UNDER THE 90-DAY "PROJECT SCOPING" AGREEMENTS BY SELECTED CONSULTANTS.** The CEO will request that the Board of Directors accept a "gift in kind" in the amount of $77,939 from the Music Concourse and Garage Fund, a project of the Community Initiative Funds of the San Francisco Foundation. This gift in kind represents the aggregate fees for professional services provided under the 90-day Project Scoping Agreements. **(ACTION ITEM)**

7. **DISCUSSION OF THE TRANSPORTATION FEASIBILITY STUDY.** The President will facilitate a discussion of the Transportation Feasibility Study, submitted to the Board in February, and will solicit input from the Board regarding the implementation planning process. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2727**
**Fax: (415) 831-2099**

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

F
45
2
10/01

# Minutes of the April 10, 2001 Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, a California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on April 10, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

## ROLL CALL:

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, Tammy Haygood, Jim Lazarus, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, and Margaret O'Sullivan. John Rizzo was absent. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

## APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

CEO Ellzey reported that Secretary John Rizzo has begun to review and comment on the minutes prior to board circulation as requested. Phil Carleton, from the Alliance for Golden Gate Park, asked how the minutes could be obtained on the Internet. Executive Assistant Julia Kay stated that she would provide the exact address.

There being no further comments, a motion was made to approve the minutes of the last meeting and it was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 13, 2001.

## CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:

**CEO Ellzey provided an update of consultant activities, including the environmental review process and the planned near- and longer-term public involvement program.**

CEO Ellzey provided a monthly overview of the project, particularly as it relates to progress under the ongoing consulting contracts in connection with the current phase in which the Authority is now involved, which is the conceptual design phase. The Authority continues to hold community workshops for the purpose of accepting input on design alternatives from the public. Gordon H. Chong & Partners and MCK Associates continue their technical evaluation on factors that will impact the ultimate design decision including costing, pedestrian circulation, vertical treatment, garage location, and size. At the next board meeting, the Authority will have an extensive overview on the design evaluation work as it is emerging from the community workshops and stakeholder meetings. There will be two more community workshops scheduled regarding the design alternatives. At the June session it is expected that the Authority will select a preferred design direction so that the schematic design phase and the environmental review process can begin.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

MAY 10 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**PRESENTATION BY PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT ON THE COMMUNITY WORKSHOP CONVENED BY THE CONCOURSE AUTHORITY ON TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 2001.**

Kay Wilson from Public Affairs Management summarized the proceedings of the community workshop convened on April 3rd to discuss transit and traffic planning objectives and the range of design alternatives currently under evaluation.

The April 3rd meeting was very well attended. Ms. Wilson thanked the Commissioners who were helpful in getting the word out, thereby assuring such good attendance. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an overview of the project starting with the background of the Authority through the community process. Gordon Chong from Gordon H. Chong & Partners presented the six alternatives that were currently under evaluation as well as the Sierra Club transportation overlay alternative.

Ms. Wilson reported that the following key issues were raised at the workshop:

- Costing continues to be of concern
- The park must be friendly and a priority for children
- Tree protection is important
- The historical features of the Concourse must remain intact and/or restored accordingly
- The importance of a pedestrian oasis
- Reaffirmation of the initial intents of Proposition J

The pros and cons of each alternative were examined. And the comments focused on general issues as summarized above.

Ms. Wilson spent a couple of minutes summarizing PAM's outreach program. The program includes everything from media releases to individual phone calls to key community leaders in order to elicit new participation. As the project moves forward into the next phases, PAM will begin to explore the possibility of televised meetings as suggested by Director Haygood. It has also begun individual stakeholder meetings with broad, citywide groups such as SPUR, the Sierra Club, community leaders, and neighborhood groups.

Lastly, Ms. Wilson reported that the WebPage is progressing and the goal is to have that up before the May 1st workshop.

Chris Duderstadt asked for clarification of comments made by the CEO at the workshop. CEO Ellzey confirmed a couple of points; first that the garage entrances, re-grading, and re-landscaping over the garage will be paid for with private funds. Secondly, that an augmentation to the parking study has been discussed since the transportation feasibility study was submitted that will include an overall study of existing conditions for parking in and around the neighborhoods, the Concourse area, and the entire park.

Mr. Duderstadt also suggested that it would be helpful to have information on employees and volunteer parking needs from the institutions and RecPark.

**Item # 5 was postponed and will occur at the May meeting.**

## ACCEPTANCE OF GIFT IN KIND OF WORK COMPLETED UNDER THE 90-DAY "PROJECT SCOPING" AGREEMENTS BY SELECTED CONSULTANTS.

CEO Ellzey requested that the Board of Directors accept a "gift in kind" in the amount of $77,989 from the Music Concourse and Garage Fund (MCGF), a project of the Community Initiatives Fund of the San Francisco Foundation. This gift in kind represents the aggregate fees for professional services under the 90-day project scoping agreements.

CEO Ellzey provided the board with some background regarding the 90-day scoping process for the four consultants that took place between December and March, and he provided a summary of their final expenses as follows:

| Consultant | Not-to-exceed Amount | Final Close-out |
|---|---|---|
| Gordon H. Chong & Partners | $30,000 | $30,000 |
| MCK Associates | $12,500 | $11,800 |
| EIP Associates | $37,500 | $ 6,092 |
| Public Affairs Management | $30,000 | $30,000 |

CEO Ellzey reported briefly on the accomplishments under the 90-day scoping process. Director Lazarus thanked the donors for making the funds available in order to allow us to proceed as we continue to develop the long-range agreements. Phil Carleton requested that more figures appear in the minutes.

There being no further comments, a motion was made to accept this gift on behalf of the City and it was **RESOLVED** to accept a gift in kind from MCGF for the work completed under the 90-day 'project scoping' agreements by selected consultants.

## DISCUSSION OF THE TRANSPORTATION FEASIBILITY STUDY:

**President Connor facilitated a discussion of the transportation feasibility study, submitted to the board in February, and solicited input from the Board regarding the implementation planning process.**

Asking everyone to keep in mind the Authority's objectives and purpose, President Connor went through each of the nine issues from Section 8 of Proposition J, which are part of the Transportation Feasibility Study, and invited the directors to consider how they would like to move forward as the Authority begins to prioritize its projects for the CEO. Once this is done, the Authority will approve through resolution the recommendations set forth in the plan that the Authority deems to be feasible and then implement those programs with funds raised privately for this purpose, which is $1.55 million over a five year period.

Director Haygood asked that Marilyn Duffey from the Duffey Company make recommendations to the board for better understanding of costing and funding options for the various projects from the May 1, 2000 proposal letter that were considered in the transportation feasibility study.

Ms. Duffey reported that all of these actions in the feasibility study are related to one another. Placing a priority on what should come first is really up to the board. RecPark is implementing some of them as part of its Master Plan, DPT already has a traffic-calming program in place, and Muni is working on transportation improvements. She recommended drawing upon the experiences of these departments to see if they would coordinate well in Golden Gate Park. Through cooperative efforts, the Authority could help to implement some of the actions that are outlined in the Proposition that are already being worked on by other agencies. Many agencies have already made it clear that they are committed to the Authority and are eager to assist it. Ms. Duffey recommended working groups that could meet with the various departments in order to establish such cooperative efforts.

After hearing the discussions on the implementation of the transportation action plan, CEO Ellzey added that the Authority is ready to proceed to the next step. The implementation planning work has already begun for an intrapark shuttle and there still needs to be an analysis of priorities for the remaining components. Some of those priorities will be higher and some will be longer-term. CEO Ellzey will work with the Duffey Company and Wilbur Smith Associates in developing a broad implementation plan so that the Authority can move forward.

President Conner remarked that it would be important to keep in mind the longer-term actions while considering the expenditures of the more immediate programs so as not to fall short of implementation monies.

CEO Ellzey will discuss the implementation plan at the next meeting, including ideas on prioritization. He will also begin discussions with the Duffey Company and Nelson Nygaard in order to produce the implementation plan.

Director O'Sullivan cautioned the Authority to move quickly in order to survey the institutions regarding their transportation and parking needs while they are still open for business. CEO Ellzey said that that could be done quickly as an easily achievable survey.

President Conner asked for public discussion.

There was some concern regarding the enforcement of timed parking. There doesn't seem to be support from the enforcement agencies.

CEO Ellzey agreed that implementation of timed parking is useless without enforceability. He will be contacting the Richmond Police Department for comment.

Chris Duderstadt has posted a map generated by William Hammond Hall in 1870 that shows a transverse road that passes across the park and passes across the middle of the Concourse. He supports those initial efforts from the past as a better road plan for the park. He is currently involved in discussions with RecPark and the Academy regarding his plans for a more efficient road system in the park.

Tom Harriman recommended that we include the nearby garages in our parking studies as many people who park in the park do so because those garages cost too much.

Phil Carleton felt the shuttle plan to be disappointing. He believes that if we cannot begin the shuttle by early summer, it will fail after the institutions are closed for construction. He also suggested the use of radar to determine speed violators and that there be better enforcement of both speeding and littering laws. Jane Nurre disagreed with Mr. Carleton regarding the shuttle. She believes its implementation should wait until the institutions reopen. Ann Lanzerotti suggested that the shuttle route go near the areas of road closure .

## DIRECTORS' BUSINESS:

**This item allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items.**

There were no items raised under Directors' Business.

## PUBLIC COMMENT:

Jane Nurre passed around a portion of the voters' pamphlet and sample ballot from Proposition J for comparison of the legal text of the proposition. She also requested that the Authority have more budget discussions and provide something in writing regarding the inflow and outflows of funds. CEO Ellzey replied that the amount budgeted for the city is the same amount from last year, $175,000 and that there will be a budget presentation in May.

Phil Carleton asked about the status of the MOU and when that will be made public. CEO Ellzey replied that the MOU is currently under negotiation. Once it is out of the negotiating stage and is submitted to the board for approval, the MOU will become public.

The Board thanked the Duffey Company for its hard work on the Transportation Feasibility Study.

## ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

SF
G45
1
5/8/01
3

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, May 8, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

Fax 5/3/01
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
MAY - 8 2001
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 10, 2001 **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

Project Overview. The CEO will provide an update of consultant activities, including the environmental review process and the planned near- and longer-term public involvement program.

Budget Review. The CEO will provide an update on the budget for the Concourse Authority operations and the Authority's project budget for the improvements being planned for the Music Concourse area.

Transportation Implementation Plan Review. The CEO will provide a preliminary overview of plans under consideration for the Concourse Authority's Transportation Implementation Plan.

4. **PRESENTATION BY RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT ON THE CONDITION OF THE TREES IN THE MUSIC CONCOURSE.** A member of the Recreation and Park staff will review for the board the results of a preliminary analysis of the condition of the Concourse-area trees and the impact on these trees that could be expected as a result of construction of an underground parking facility. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **PRESENTATION BY GORDON H. CHONG & PARTNERS ON THE CONCEPTUAL DESIGN ALTERNATIVES FOR THE UNDERGROUND PARKING FACILITY IN THE MUSIC CONCOURSE AREA OF GOLDEN GATE PARK.** A representative of Gordon H. Chong & Partners, project architects, will review the six parking facility design alternatives currently under evaluation by the Concourse Authority. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **ELIMINATION OF DESIGN ALTERNATIVE(S) FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION.** The CEO may recommend one or more of the design alternatives currently under evaluation from further consideration by the Authority. **(DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION)**

7. **PRESENTATION BY PUBLIC AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT ON THE STATUS OF THE AUTHORITY'S COMMUNITY RELATIONS AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM.** A staff member of Public Affairs Management (PAM) will provide an overview of the Concourse Authority's community relations and public outreach programs. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898
Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

8. **PRESENTATION BY RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT ON THE STATUS OF THE PROJECT TO DESIGN AND CONSTRUCT IMPROVEMENTS TO AN INTERSECTION IN THE EASTERN END OF GOLDEN GATE PARK** A representative of the Recreation and Park Department will update the Board on the status of the conceptual improvement plan for the renovation of the JFK Drive/Kezar Drive intersection. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

9. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

10. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

F
45
2
8/01

# FINAL MINUTES OF THE MAY 8, 2001 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on May 8, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

## 1. ROLL CALL:

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, Tammy Haygood, Jim Lazarus, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan and John Rizzo. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

There was a correction to the Minutes of the April 2001 board meeting. On page three in the last paragraph the reference was made to "a proposal letter dated May 2000" rather than "Section 8 of Proposition J." There being no further comments, a motion was made to approve the minutes of the last meeting and it was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 10, 2001.

## 3. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:

CEO Ellzey provided an update of consultant activities, including the environmental review process and the planned near- and longer-term public involvement program. He deferred the project overview portion of his report to the discussions that will take place during the remainder of the meeting wherein the Authority will receive updates and an overview of the Authority's design evaluation work and the external community relations program leading up to the June 12th meeting where it is expected that a preferred alternative will be selected thus beginning the EIR process and the schematic design phase of the project.

CEO Ellzey provided a budget update for the Concourse Authority's operations and for the improvements being planned for the Music Concourse area.

The CEO presented a draft outline of plans under consideration for the Concourse Authority Transportation Implementation Plan. The items that are under consideration are listed below:

- Intrapark shuttle program
- Parking management
- Traffic calming measures
- Muni Improvements
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues
- Cultural Shuttle

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

JUN 14 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Director Haygood commented on the transportation implementation plan and asked about the flexibility of the priorities. CEO Ellzey invited all recommendations regarding this issue and said many of these items are being worked on simultaneously. She asked about the budget detail regarding the IntraPark Shuttle program under the Transportation Feasibility Study. CEO Ellzey said that the $48,000 is the budget under discussion for the

implementation planning component and there will be a full discussion of accomplishments to date at the next meeting regarding the intrapark shuttle program implementation.

President Conner stated that since the items listed on the Transportation Implementation Plan are so interdependent, it is important the shared roadway plan be studied in the near term.

Jane Nurre thanked CEO Ellzey for providing the budget for public review. She then asked about the general fund for the City. CEO Ellzey replied that the City portion of the Authority's budget could found under the RecPark budget (Golden Gate Concourse Construction Project.)

**4. PRESENTATION BY RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT ON THE CONDITION OF THE TREES IN THE MUSIC CONCOURSE.**

Dan McKenna of the Recreation and Park staff reviewed for the board the results of a preliminary analysis of the condition of the Concourse-area trees and the impact on these trees that could be expected as a result of construction of an underground parking facility.

Mr. McKenna reported that the trees in the concourse area have been subject to a lot of compaction and their root systems and the trees themselves are not as vigorous as those that have been grown in the irrigated grassy areas and in areas of less foot traffic. However, the trees are generally in good condition and may live another 60 to 100 years as a useful presence to this area. These species are generally easy to transplant except that the trees have grown so close to one another that they have joined root systems and moving them would yield about a 60% success rate. In addition, it would take ten years or more to simulate the trunk caliber and the development of callous-wood that would duplicate the existing landscape after significant construction or excavation.

There are about fifty mature eucalyptus trees behind the bandshell and are not subject to being moved. There are also Monterey Cypress tress that are in very good shape that grow in the area. These trees are growing about the grade of the bandshell on a mound and are somewhat contained. Excavation adjacent to these stands would compromise the stability of the trees. These trees provide a backdrop to the bandshell as well as a windscreen for the visitors to that area. However, there should be a removal of a small percent of the tree that are exhibiting significant lean toward the bandshell as well as a general pruning and thinning of the canopies.

President Conner asked if the trees behind the bandshell were the sole windbreak for the Music Concourse area and whether it would be possible to eliminate one row of trees while adding to the second tier in order to produce the same effect. Mr. McKenna answered that Strawberry Hill provides a significant amount of wind protection as well as the trees leading up to Stow Lake. As far as adding trees to the second tier, the trees in the park need a clear sky and full sunlight and it would be difficult to start seedlings or young trees in that area.

Director MacColl asked about the age of the eucalyptus behind the bandshell and how long they usually live. Mr. McKenna replied that not many eucalyptus trees in Golden Gate Park have ever died and there are many that are as old as one hundred years.

Director Haygood asked about mitigation measures that could be used during construction so as not to disturb the trees. Mr. McKenna replied that the International Society of Arboricultural has construction standards for tree preservation, which is basically keeping construction workers out of the general area of the tree. Mr. McKenna will provide a copy of those standards to the Authority.

**5. PRESENTATION BY GORDON H. CHONG & PARTNERS ON THE CONCEPTUAL DESIGN ALTERNATIVE FOR THE UNDERGROUND PARKING FACILITY IN THE MUSIC CONCOURSE AREA OF GOLDEN GATE PARK.**

Geoff Adams of Gordon H. Chong & Partners, project architects, reviewed the six parking facility design alternatives currently under evaluation by the Concourse Authority. Mr. Adams went through the presentation that was presented at the community workshop on May 1st which outlined each of the six alternatives including comments from previous community workshops.

Mr. Adams reported that Gordon H. Chong & Partners is currently evaluating the surface of the Music Concourse area and has a good understanding of the possibilities that exist. It is looking at the pedestrian circulation in and out of the garage and how that will interface with the surface. It is also evaluating the surface roadways and possibilities that exist there.

President Conner asked about the efficiency of the garages. Mr. Adams said that, due to the constraints of the site, all of the alternatives are somewhat inefficient.

Director Rizzo commented that although alternative #2 is the most efficient in terms of square footage, it is also the most expensive. Mr. Adams replied that the costs of reconstructing the concourse surface are included.

Director Lazarus asked about the elimination of the tunnels and has concerns regarding that issue. He asked if the tunnels could provide through access for the pedestrians into and out of the garage at the first level. Mr. Adams replied that there could be through access into garage through those tunnel locations. CEO Ellzey added that during the course of construction those tunnels may be destroyed, but that does not preclude the reestablishment of a pedestrian service and preservation of the historical features of the tunnels. Director Lazarus had ideas regarding the development of alternative #4. Director Lum stated that there seems a lot more efficiency in alternative #4 regarding the Sierra Club Plan.

Director MacColl asked about alternative #1 and asked how wide is the connector tunnel between the two pods. Mr. Adams replied that those connecting tunnels would be three lanes wide and could be reversible depending on traffic flow.

Director Lazarus addressed concerns about the access tunnels creating a bottleneck in the park during special events and recommends traffic studies that look carefully at that issue as part of the EIR process.

Director Haygood asked if there should be surface restoration costs on alternative #5 included in the estimates. Mr. Adams replied that there are some restoration costs included for the pavement and the planting of new trees.

President Conner expressed some concern regarding the difference between the funds being raised privately for the garage with actual cost estimates of the six alternatives. She asked for an examination of what could be built for a lesser amount. Mr. Adams replied that this is already being explored and that such a garage would be approximately 600-650 spaces. President Conner asked that CEO Ellzey look into a funding package that will fund the garage project and that would be acceptable to everyone.

Public testimony on this item was reserved until after item #6 as they are closely related.

**6. Elimination of Design Alternative(s) from further consideration**

CEO Ellzey made his recommendation regarding the elimination of garage designs. Through the course of the Authority's analysis and community outreach process, it has become clear that Alternatives #2 and #3 – which propose a severe disruption to the Music Concourse – are inconsistent with the spirit of Proposition J, in that their construction would necessitate a significant disruption to the Music Concourse bowl. Moreover, it is apparent, based on a letter issued by RecPark dated April 2, 2001, that a significant number of trees in the concourse bowl would likely not survive the removal, storage and replacement process necessary for construction of parking beneath the bowl. For these reasons, staff recommends that Alternatives #2 and #3 be eliminated from further consideration by the Concourse Authority as feasible design options for an underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

Director Rizzo moved for the elimination of alternatives #2 and #3 in the belief that the voters did not intend for the reconstruction of the Music Concourse area when they voted for Proposition J. Director Haygood seconded the motion.

Phil Carleton from the Alliance for Golden Gate Park, gave a breakdown of the cost of the of the garage alternatives by cost per stall.

There being no further comment on this item it was **RESOLVED** to eliminate garage design alternatives 2 and 3 from further consideration by the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.

**Further public testimony on the design alternatives in general from item #5.**

Chris Duderstadt commented that if a garage entrance if located from outside of the park, as stipulated in Proposition J, then those who use the garage will not be driving in the park. There is a potential for removing a lot of the congestion.

Pinky Kushner commented on three points. There should be a good understanding of the parking needs of the institutions. The architects should consider the G-line with a turnaround behind the bandshell. She urged the Authority to concentrate on a pedestrian oasis and wants to hear it mentioned often.

Thomas Harriman of the San Francisco Bicycle coalition believes that garage entrances and exits along MLK Drive would compromise the function of the G-line when a backup occurs due to a full garage. Joe Fusco asked that the Authority suggested another design alternative, which would place the garage under the institutions. Carolyn Blair from the San Francisco Tree Council encouraged the elimination of alternative 5 in order to save the trees behind the bandshell. Steve Boseman of Walk SF suggested that we do not disturb the historic tunnels and stated his desire for a no garage alternative.

## 7. Presentation by Public Affairs Management on the Status oof the Authority's Community Relations and Public Involvement Program.

Kay Wilson from Public Affairs Management provided an overview of the Concourse Authority's community relations and public outreach programs. Ms. Wilson announced that the next community workshop would be televised on CityWatch, Channel 26 and that the project information site will be available for public viewing starting on May 9th. The address is www.goldengateparkconcourse .org and gave photo credits on the website to Chris Duderstadt. She acknowledged the contributions of Director Rizzo on technical issues that surrounded the implementation of the website. The website is designed for modifications and is interactive with the public. PAM continues to conduct stakeholder meetings with neighborhood groups and groups of interest.

CEO Ellzey commended PAM and MIG for an outstanding job on the community relations and public involvement program. President Conner asked that the Website indicate that stakeholder meetings are available to any and all interest groups. Director Rizzo encouraged the board members add content to the website by contacting staff if there is something that they deem important.

Pinky Kushner wants to see more information about the garage in the *San Francisco Chronicle* and the *Independent*. Jane Nurre asked for updates on the attendance at the community workshops. Phil Carleton asked that Mr. Duderstadt's design proposal be considered very seriously. Another comment asked for an integrated EIR that includes the de Young project, the Academy project, as well as the garage project.

## 8. Presentation by Recreation and Park Department on the Status of the Project to Design and Construct Improvements to an Intersection in the Eastern End of Golden Gate Park.

Dan Mauer, Landscape Architect and Project Manager with the Recreation and Park Department updated the Board on the status of the conceptual improvement plan for the renovation of the JFK Drive/Kezar Drive intersection. Mr. Mauer reported that the Authority's project design team and RecPark are working on current and future projects in Golden Gate Park to make sure that they dovetail with the Music Concourse area project. He identified two traffic-calming measures called for in the Golden Gate Park Master Plan as part of the circulation program. One of which is to create "T" intersection at the eastern entrance of the Park along JFK and the second element is to introduce landscape extensions or bulbouts along JFK from Stanyan Street to Transverse Drive. Due to cost constraints and coordination with the Music Concourse area project, landscape extensions were put on hold and the department is moving forward with the roadway modification of the entrance.

The goals are to slow traffic entering the park and provide a more defined circulation route for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

## 9. Directors' Business:

**This item allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items.**

Director Lum wants to address the disadvantages of Alternative #5 over #4 and is concerned about the elimination of the trees behind the bandshell and the impact of a potential G-line turnaround. Director Lazarus suggested the Authority look at combining alternatives #4 and #5 and requested serious consideration of the Sierra Club Plan as being an integral part of the garage.

## 10. Public Comment:

Joe Fusco urged the Authority to take a closer look at the number of projected visitors and separate visitors to the Music Concourse area from visitors to Golden Gate Park in general. He believes that the projected numbers are too low and the projections need to consider future visitors through the decades to come. Phil Carleton stressed the importance of enforcement of traffic violations. CEO Ellzey replied that staff has met with the Richmond District Police Department and have addressed these concerns. There will be a future presentation to the Authority from that department.

## 11. Adjournment:

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

F
45
1
/12/01
c.2

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, June 12, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

lcp 6/7/01
DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUN 11 2001
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
   Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 8, 2001. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT.** Members of the project team will be recognized.

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

   **Project Overview**. The CEO will provide an update of the Authority's project activities.

   **Public Involvement and Community Relations Program Update**. The CEO will summarize the public involvement process conducted to date and will review the May 30th Community Workshop.

   **Intra-park Shuttle Implementation Plan Update.** The CEO will provide an update on the implementation plan for the Intra-Park Shuttle: Pilot Program 2001 in Golden Gate Park.

5. **ELECTION OF OFFICERS.** Discussion and possible action, in accordance with Article VII, Section 1, of the bylaws of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, to elect a President, Vice President, Treasurer and Secretary. **(DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION)**

6. **SELECTION OF PREFERRED DESIGN ALTERNATIVE FOR THE UNDERGROUND PARKING FACILITY TO BE CONSTRUCTED IN THE MUSIC CONCOURSE AREA OF GOLDEN GATE PARK.** The CEO may recommend one of the five remaining design alternatives for designation as a "preferred alternative" for purposes of beginning the EIR process and initiating schematic design. **(DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION)**

7. **AUTHORIZATION TO INITIATE EIR AND DESIGN PROCESS.** The CEO will request that the Board of Directors authorize staff to pursue steps necessary and appropriate to initiate the environmental review and design process for the underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park. **(DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION)**

8. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
   This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

SF
45
2
12/01

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
JUL 11 2001
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

# FINAL MINUTES OF THE JUNE 12, 2001 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on June 12, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

## 1. ROLL CALL:

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, Tammy Haygood, Jim Lazarus, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan and John Rizzo. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 10, 2001.

## 3. PRESIDENT'S REPORT:

President Conner recognized the accomplishments of two members of the project team. Marilyn Duffey, President of the Duffey Company was honored by the Women's Transportation Seminar and awarded 'Employer of the Year'. Gordon Chong of Gordon H. Chong & Partners is President-elect for the American Institute of Architects and will begin his term in January 2002.

President Conner remarked on the recent hearing called by Supervisor Gonzalez regarding the construction projects in the Music Concourse on June 7, 2001. She strongly emphasized that the mandate passed by the voters in 1998 is being protected and it is not the desire of the Authority to alter that language of the ballot measure. (See letter attached.)

## 4. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:

CEO Ellzey provided an update of consultant activities. He reported that the Authority is now in a position to conclude the project definition phase. This will allow the Authority to begin the EIR process and the schematic design effort. Moving forward, the public will be engaged to assist in identifying the impacts of the selected alternative and to help with the further development of the transportation, transit and parking management plan.

CEO Ellzey summarized the public involvement process that has been conducted to date and reviewed the May 30th, 2001 Community Workshop. He reported that there have been four community workshops to date. The first workshop was held on March 12, 2001. The primary focus was discussion of the Transportation Feasibility Plan and an intrapark shuttle. Subsequently there were three specific workshops to review the various design alternatives with the public, the last of which was televised for CityWatch.

Ms. Kay Wilson of Public Affairs Management made a few remarks regarding the overall strategy for the public involvement program. She reported that apart from the Community

Workshops, PAM has conducted several stakeholder meetings for groups that range from park and pedestrian advocates to neighborhood associations, and architectural and historical interests, as well as a couple of individuals who requested meetings. Ms. Wilson summarized some of the key issues that were brought up at the last workshop. Some of the concerns that were raised involve the preservation of the historic features of the Music Concourse. Other comments expressed concerns regarding neighborhood impacts. It was also suggested that the Authority explore pedestrian needs separate from bicycle needs.

Ms. Marilyn Duffey from the Duffey Company made a few remarks about the status of the Intra-Park Shuttle Implementation Plan. She reported that the grant application has been completed and submitted to the San Francisco Transportation Authority. She has prepared a draft Request for Proposal (RFP) and has finalized a list of service providers to send the RFP. There will be a pre-proposal conference and then the proposals will be due in early July and the service should be awarded by the end of July so that it will start in August and run through October.

CEO Ellzey reported that, in addition to the intra-park shuttle, two other items on the Transportation Implementation Plan are being considered. One is the traffic-calming program. Ms. Duffey and CEO Ellzey have met with DPT and have begun to develop criteria to review potential traffic calming measures for implementation in the near-term. Secondly, the Authority will assume the oversight of the Timed-Parking Program from RecPark that had been originally developed by staff and DPT in concert with UCSF.

## 5. Election of Officers

President Conner announced that item #5 will be postponed. On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was **RESOLVED** that the officers as present would remain in an acting capacity until next month's Board meeting.

## 6. Selection of Preferred Design Alternative for the Underground Parking Facility to be Constructed in the Music Concourse of Golden Gate Park.

CEO Ellzey made his recommendation for one of the five remaining design alternatives for designation as a "preferred alternative" for purposes of beginning the EIR process and initiating schematic design. CEO Ellzey briefly described the remaining alternatives for the purpose of delineating some distinctions among them. For the Board and Community's edification there were design boards showing each alternative for reference. He noted that the Sierra Club Transit Access Proposal could work with any of the alternatives and is being considered separately and distinctly.

There was some brief discussion regarding the Sierra Club proposal and whether there are significant cost savings from one alternative to the next.

CEO Ellzey read to the Board his recommendation letter dated June 12, 2001 (copy attached.) After due consideration of the characteristics of the five remaining alternatives, and the extent to which each addresses the programs and policies conferred upon the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority by the "Act" CEO Ellzey recommended to the

Board "Alternative 4" as the preferred design alternative. He then invited comments from both the Board and the public.

Director Lazarus clarified that the EIR process can develop design changes that can add or subtract from the size of the garage. CEO Ellzey added that the exercise began with the development "Alternative #1", which was the base alternative, and the subsequent alternatives were developed in line with #1 in order to make similar comparisons. There will be a refining of the design as the project moves along.

There was general support in that "Alternative #4" allows for the opportunity within the design for the inclusion of an underground transit facility. Gina Messa from EIP & Associates spoke to the process of the EIR and there was some discussion of how to go about the inclusion of a study that will consider the Sierra Club proposal, which is not a part of the current plan.

Many people from the audience expressed their concerns regarding the removal and possible destruction of the historical pedestrian tunnels. CEO Ellzey remarked that the Authority is committed to preserving the historic character of the tunnels as well as enhancing pedestrian linkage. Mr. Chris Duderstadt added that "Alternative #6" does not disturb the tunnels. There was additional support for "Alternative #6" from Pinky Kushner and Phil Carleton.

There was general concern regarding the EIR process in that there be an attempt to be as comprehensive as possible. Those comments encouraged consideration of the Sierra Club Proposal, access to the institutions, traffic flow into and out of the garage, and the resulting impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods.

Director O'Sullivan would like to see a detailed study of the traffic impact on the northern side of the park. Director Lum commented that he appreciates the efforts of Chris Duderstadt, but when he weighs "Alternative 6" against #4, he believes that #4 give more opportunities to solve more transportation needs.

It was agreed that the efforts of Chris Duderstadt are invaluable to the evaluation of the garage design and the Authority would like to have such ideas continue.

There being no further comment on item #6, President Conner asked that there be a motion from the Board. On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously approved, it was **RESOLVED** That the Authority designates Alternative 4 as the preferred alternative for the purposes of beginning the EIR process. The Authority selects Alternative #4 because it is the design that best accommodates the possibilities of integrating mass transit (including bus drop-off) with the project, the elimination of through traffic in the Concourse area, and the restoration of pedestrian tunnels. Alternative #4 can also provide pedestrian access from the garage to the major locales in the area. The Authority directed staff and consultants to examine these goals.

## 7. Authorization to Initiate EIR and Design Process

CEO Ellzey requested that the Board of Directors authorize staff to pursue steps necessary and appropriate to initiate the environmental review and design process for the underground parking facility in the Music Concourse in Golden Gate Park. CEO Ellzey expressed appreciation to the Board for the above action, which enables the Authority to move forward and begin the EIR process and to commission the schematic design effort.

Director Lum reiterated the need to examine the Sierra Plan in the EIR. CEO Ellzey replied that he would specifically explore that subject.

There were requests from the Board to explain some of the descriptions of milestone progress that will be made during the construction documents development. Gordon Chong from Gordon H. Chong & Partners stated that specific concerns would be addressed along the way in the construction documents. Development of sequencing will be addressed in coordination meetings with the City and with the construction management coordinator.

Phil Carleton and Mary Anne Miller expressed some concern regarding the EIR in that it may not be far reaching enough if the Authority limits itself by studying only a couple of alternatives. They would like to see a comprehensive EIR, which includes all of the projects in the Music Concourse Area and the surrounding neighborhoods.

There being no further comment on item #7; on motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried it was **RESOLVED** That staff be authorized to pursue steps necessary and appropriate to initiate the environmental review and design process for the underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

## 8. Directors' Business:

**This item allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items.**

There was none.

## 9. Public Comment:

Chris Duderstadt gave the Authority some alternatives to the Sierra Club "trench."

## 10. Adjournment:

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

:45
1
7/10/01
c.2
1st 7/6/01)

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

JUL - 9 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, July 10, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

07-09-01A09:39 RCVD

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 12, 2001 **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

**Project Overview**. The CEO will provide an update of the Authority's project activities.

**Environmental Review Process Update**. The CEO will introduce EIP Associates, environmental consultant to the Authority, who will discuss with the Board the anticipated process and estimated schedule for the preparation of the environmental impact report for the project.

**Design and Approval Process Update**. The CEO will introduce Gordon H. Chong & Partners, design consultants to the Authority, who will discuss with the Board the anticipated activities under the "Design and Approval" Phase of the project.

**Intra-park Shuttle Implementation Plan Update.** The CEO will introduce The Duffey Company, transportation consultants to the Authority, who will provide an update on the implementation plan for the Intra-Park Shuttle: Pilot Program 2001 in Golden Gate Park.

4. **APPROVAL OF A LETTER AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY INITIATIVES FUND AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.** The CEO may request authorization to execute, on behalf of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a letter agreement between the Community Initiatives Fund, a California non-profit public benefit corporation ("CIF") and the City and County of San Francisco, acting by and through the Authority, regarding the funding commitment related to the design and construction of the Underground Parking Facility. **(DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION)**

5. **AUTHORIZE EXTENSION OF PROJECT AGREEMENTS WITH SELECTED CONSULTANTS FOR AN ADDITIONAL ONE YEAR TO COMPLETE THE "DESIGN AND APPROVAL" PHASE OF THE PROJECT.** The CEO will request that the Board of Directors authorize an extension of existing consulting agreements for an additional one year for the purpose of completing the "Design and Approval Phase" of the project. The extended agreements will have an effective date of July 1, 2001 and will expire on June 30, 2002. The budget for the Design and Approval Phase of the project, as described in the Letter Agreement between CIF and the Authority, will not exceed $5,130,000. The project phases and scope of work to be performed in the Design and Approval Phase is generally described in the Letter Agreement to be executed between the Community Initiatives Fund and the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. **(DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

6. **ELECTION OF OFFICERS.** In accordance with Article VII, Section 1, of the bylaws of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, a President, Vice President, Treasurer, Secretary and a Chief Executive Officer will be elected. **(DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION)**

7. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

45
2
1/10/01

# FINAL MINUTES OF THE JULY 10, 2001 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on July 10, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

## 1. ROLL CALL:

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, Jim Lazarus, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, Margaret O'Sullivan and John Rizzo. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:45 p.m.

President Conner announced some changes to the agenda. Items #4 and 5 will not be discussed however, the Authority will hear public testimony on these items in sequence.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

There was an amendment to the Minutes of June 12, 2001. Director Rizzo corrected the resolution on item #6, which better reflects the overall objective of the action. On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was **RESOLVED** to approve the amended minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 12, 2001.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

AUG 3 0 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

## 3. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:

### Project Overview

CEO Ellzey provided an update of the Authority's project activities and made some general comments about the progress of the last month. He reported that, at the last board meeting, the Authority received authorization to proceed on the EIR process and begin schematic design. In the past month staff has been preparing to meet with the Planning Department's Environmental Review Officer and expect to conduct an initial meeting by month's end. The Planning Department will direct the scope of the project and the evaluation process during the EIR.

There have been several meetings with the project team to discuss the schematic design process and how that is to proceed. There will be particular attention paid to the surface circulation issues as far as vertical access, roadway access and pedestrian access. The Authority will also look into the possibility of a transit center and the feasibility of a through tunnel as proposed by the Sierra Club.

The implementation of the shuttle program is moving forward as staff explores way in which to procure services for the pilot program.

### Environmental Review Process Update

CEO Ellzey introduced Michael Rice, Deputy Regional Manager from EIP Associates, environmental consultant to the Authority, to discuss with the Board the anticipated activities under the "Design and Approval" Phase of the project. Mr. Rice expressed that

the EIR is a collaborative effort with the Authority, consultants, sub-consultants and other City departments. The responsibility of the lead agency is to ensure that the environmental process is complete, accurate and objective. Mr. Rice reported on the key steps of the EIR process. The first public document is the initial study and Notice of Preparation (NOP). The initial study defines the approach to the EIR and will be circulated and posted for 30 days. During that time, agencies and community groups can comment on the scope of the EIR and the range of alternatives. The NOP should be issued by Fall of 2001.

The draft EIR will be the major product of the EIR process and will include the full analysis of the preferred alternatives, mitigation measures for adverse impacts, and a comparative review of alternatives to the proposed project. It is anticipated that the draft EIR will be issued in early 2002. The Draft EIR will circulate for 45 days during which there will be a public hearing before the Planning Commission to take testimony on the content and adequacy of the EIR. All of the comments and responses received in the 45 days will be compiled and brought back to the Planning Commission for a certification decision. That is anticipated for late Spring 2002. Public comments will be addressed in detail in writing as part of the certified EIR.

Certification of the EIR represents a finding that the environmental information about the proposed project is complete, accurate and objective. Certification does not confer any approval to any actions by the Authority or others. It becomes the basis for information that will be considered by the Authority or other parties in making decisions about proceeding with the garage and other improvements and changes in the Concourse area.

Director Lum asked how the comments and responses would interface with the design process. Mr. Rice replied that once the Authority had made a decision about the conceptual plan, it would be what is analyzed in the EIR. CEQA also requires that alternatives be analyzed. The emphasis in alternatives is to present and compare impacts on an alternative that will have different or lesser environmental impacts than the proposed project. The public review process would allow comment on the effects of the preferred alternative and how to adjust the project. The EIR itself is not necessarily in of itself a vehicle for commenting on the project.

CEO Ellzey added that there is an interrelationship between the planning department and its decision in terms of developing a scope. The planning department and the Authority are the final agencies in the development of a scope. The Authority has three projects within Proposition J, the underground parking facility, the Concourse design, and the transportation parking management plan. In the product produced for the Planning Department we would describe the three projects as sub-projects of the Concourse Authority's work.

**Design and Approval Process Update**

CEO Ellzey introduced Geoff Adams, Principle from Gordon H. Chong & Partners, design consultants to the Authority, to discuss with the Board the anticipated activities under the "Design and Approval" Phase of the project.

Mr. Adams summarized the major activities that will occur over the next year consisting of two design phases and construction documents. During schematic design, Gordon H. Chong & Partners will be considering the Concourse area for overall site and transportation improvements beyond the footprint of the garage, in order to incorporate the garage into the broader context. The design development and construction documents include the parking facility, access tunnels and immediately related surface improvements.

The primary purpose of the two design phases is for communication with the Authority, interested agencies, institutions and the public. By the end of the design phases, there will be a very clear picture of the project and what costs will be. After design development, Gordon H. Chong & Partners will develop construction documents for the purpose of describing the project in terms that the contractor will need to build the project. This design effort will run concurrently with the environmental review as well as a continuous public participation process.

There was a brief discussion as to which parts of the design would become evident during which phase of the project and how each phase will coordinate with the other institutions' projects in the area.

**Public Involvement Review for the Upcoming Year**

CEO Ellzey introduced Kristy Ranieri from Public Affairs Management to comment on the Public Involvement process that will coincide with the EIR process and what will be anticipated for public involvement during the next year. Ms. Ranieri reported that the stakeholder group meeting process will continue to take place, as well as one on one meetings. The Web Site work will continue to be expanded. A new component to the outreach process will be the addition of newsletters and other forms of involvement.

**Intra-park Shuttle Implementation Plan Update**

CEO Ellzey introduced Ms. Marilyn Duffey of the Duffey Company, transportation consultants to the Authority, to discuss the implementation plan for the Intra-Park Shuttle: Pilot Program 2001 in Golden Gate Park. Ms. Duffey reported that staff has been working with HRC and the City Attorney to make sure that the Authority is in compliance for procurement of services. One of the recommendations was to separate the operation and implementation of the vehicle from the marketing and survey instrument for the IntraPark Shuttle in order to attract potential women, minority and local owned businesses. The scope of work for each project has been revised to be responsive based on input from the City Attorney and HRC. The Authority and the Duffey Company have been working to solidify the pilot program to begin in August.

Ms. Duffey reported that there has been progress in the timed parking program in Golden Gate Park. Wilbur Smith & Associates will be doing a comprehensive parking survey in the Park to update all of the marked red-zones and handicapped zones to begin to identify where the timed-parking will exist.

There was some discussion on some of the dynamics regarding the pilot program for the intra-park shuttle. It was agreed that August is the absolute latest that the Authority could implement the pilot program.

There was some discussion about the time-limited parking in Golden Gate Park regarding the enforcement of the parking restrictions and noticing. CEO Ellzey reported that the Police Captain at the Richmond station is aware of the Authority's project and intends to enforce the program. Ms. Duffey assured that Authority that there would be ample noticing and ride-share information prior to the implementation of the timed-parking program.

Public testimony encouraged the Authority to make its EIR comprehensive to include all the projects in the Concourse area and that there be a serious consideration of a no-build alternative. There was interest that the public is kept informed of advance copies of the draft EIR.

There was concern as to where the staging area(s) would be during the construction process.

There was some discussion about the shuttle and how to reduce commuter usage.

Chris Duderstadt reminded the Authority about the pedestrian tunnels and asked for guidelines in dealing with their preservation. CEO Ellzey replied that they would be considered during the remainder of the design process.

**4. Approval of a Letter Agreement between the Community Initiatives Fund and the City and County of San Francisco**

This item is postponed until further notice.

**5. Authorize Extension of Project Agreements with Selected Consultants for an Additional One Year to Complete the "Design and Approval" Phase of the Project**

This item is postponed until further notice.

**6. Election of Officers**

In accordance with Article VII, Section 1, of the bylaws of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, a President, Vice President, Treasurer, Secretary and a Chief Executive Officer is to be selected. There was a motion to open the nomination for all offices and the motion carried.

Stephanie MacColl reported on the outcome of the nominating committee. She presented a slate, which will be voted on as a whole. The nominating committee recommended and moved the following recommendations:

Nancy Conner, President,
John Lum, Vice President,
John Rizzo, Secretary/Treasurer,
and Michael Ellzey, CEO

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously approved, it was **RESOLVED** to elect the above slate of officers as presented above.

President Conner announced that Director Tammy Haygood has resigned from the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. She will be missed for her leadership and fiscal responsibility.

## 7. Directors' Business:

**This item allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items.**

There was none.

## 8. Public Comment:

There was some concern regarding the mailing list and notification of workshops for the Authority. David Spero asked if the public was going to be informed of the donors who are giving money to fund the project. Chris Duderstadt asked for more information on the parking and traffic study. Phil Carleton asked if there were to be additions to the letter of agreement between CIF and the City of San Francisco and that asked that the public be given at least 10 days notice prior to the release of the next draft version of the letter agreement.

.

## 9. Adjournment:

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10p.m.

SF
G45
#1
8/14/01
c.2

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, August 14, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

AUG 13 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of July10, 2001 **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

**Project Overview**. The CEO will provide a summary overview of the Authority's project activities.

**Environmental Review Process Update**. The CEO will introduce EIP Associates, environmental consultant to the Authority, who will discuss with the Board the status of the EIR process.

**Design and Approval Process Update**. The CEO will introduce Gordon H. Chong & Partners, design consultants to the Authority, who will update the Board on design work being planned for the Project.

**Intra-park Shuttle Implementation Plan Update**. The CEO will introduce The Duffey Company, transportation consultants to the Authority, who will provide an update on the implementation plan for the Intra-Park Shuttle Pilot Program. Representatives from Davis & Associates Public Relations and Coach USA, contractors to the Authority on the pilot shuttle program, will also be introduced.

4. **SELECTION OF SWINERTON BUILDERS AS CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/GENERAL CONTRACTOR FOR THE PROJECT.** The CEO will recommend that the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority") select Swinerton Builders as prime consultant and construction manager/general contractor to oversee pre-construction, construction management and general contractor services for the project, and that the CEO be authorized to negotiate and execute an agreement with Swinerton Builders for pre-construction services. **(POSSIBLE ACTION)**

5. **APPROVAL OF A LETTER AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY INITIATIVES FUND AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.** The CEO may request authorization to execute, on behalf of the Authority, a letter agreement between the Community Initiatives Fund, a California non-profit public benefit corporation ("CIF") and the City and County of San Francisco, acting by and through the Authority, related to a schedule and budget not to exceed $5,640,000 for professional services activities to be accomplished during the "Design and Approval" phase of the project. **(POSSIBLE ACTION)**

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2727**
**Fax: (415) 831-2099**

6. **AUTHORIZE EXTENSION OF PROJECT AGREEMENTS WITH SELECTED CONSULTANTS FOR AN ADDITIONAL ONE YEAR TO COMPLETE THE "DESIGN AND APPROVAL" PHASE OF THE PROJECT.** The CEO will request that the Board of Directors

authorize an extension of existing consulting agreements for an additional one year for the purpose of completing the "Design and Approval Phase" of the project. The project phases and scope of work to be performed in the Design and Approval Phase are generally described in the Letter Agreement to be executed between the Community Initiatives Fund and the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. **(POSSIBLE ACTION)**

7. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

8. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT 10 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

45
2
8/14/01

# FINAL MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 14, 2001 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on August 14, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

## 1. ROLL CALL:

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, Jim Lazarus, John Lum, Margaret O'Sullivan and John Rizzo. Stephanie MacColl was absent. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

President Conner announced the launch of the Golden Gate Park Shuttle on Saturday, August 18 and encouraged everyone present to attend the event.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

There was an amendment to the Minutes of July 10, 2001. Mr. Phil Carleton asked the Authority change the Public Comment section to read that Mr. Carleton had asked that the public be given at least 10 days notice prior to the release of the next draft version of the letter agreement.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was **RESOLVED** to approve the amended minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 10, 2001.

## 3. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:

### Project Overview

CEO Ellzey provided an update of the Authority's project activities and made some general comments about the progress of the last month. He reported that there have been several meetings to discuss the scope of the EIR and the discussions have gone very well. The EIR that will be undertaken will be a broad approach and the Authority will be including all of the projects in the area in its report. The focus, however, will be mainly on the design and construction of the underground parking facility, the design and implementation of the surface and roadway improvements, and the design and implementation of the parking management plan, "transit first." The Authority will be filing its Environmental Evaluation Application in the weeks to come.

In addition, staff has been working with Gordon H. Chong & Partners to prepare for the schematic design phase.

### Environmental Review Process Update

Michael Rice, Deputy Regional Manager from EIP & Associates discussed with the Board the status of the EIR process. It is anticipated that the Environmental Evaluation Application will be submitted to the Planning Department within the next week. There will be follow-up discussions with the Planning Department's staff for a more specific approach to the EIR and the EIR content. EIP has also been working with staff and

other consultants to get an overall EIR schedule. The EIR process will take approximately ten to twelve months.

**Design and Approval Process Update**

Sam Nunes, Managing Partner from Gordon H. Chong & Partners, design consultants to the Authority, gave a brief update on their activities over the course of the last month. He reported that during the past few weeks Chong & Partners have been working in four primary areas: 1) support of the environmental evaluation, providing exhibits and descriptions for the report, 2) working with RecPark in a continuous coordination of surface improvements and refining the functional design of the garage, 3) working with the de Young in coordination between the museum and the garage interface, and 4) a continuous budget reconciliation.

**Intra-park Shuttle Implementation Plan Update**

Kortney Oliver, Account Executive from Davis & Associates provided an update on the implementation plan for the Intra-Park Shuttle Pilot Program. Ms. Oliver reported that the special event to launch the pilot program that is scheduled for 11:00 A.M. on Saturday, August 18th in Golden Gate Park at the East End of the Concourse Area.

CEO Ellzey commended the work completed by Davis & Associates during the accelerated process of launching the pilot program on such a short schedule.

Marilyn Duffey encouraged everyone to come to the launch event on Saturday and to invite friends and colleagues in demonstration of the support for the Intra-Park Shuttle.

Ken Marciano and Brian Edgar reported on the operations of the shuttle. Mr. Marciano, General Manager of Coach USA/Gray Line of San Francisco reported that four vehicles will be running from one end of Golden Gate Park to the other. The goal is to evaluate the public's reception of the program. Mr. Edgar commented on the route of the shuttle. He reported that the shuttle would link with existing MUNI stops including the N-Judah. The shuttle would travel to twenty-one stops throughout the Park in a loop at approximately 20-minute intervals. The entire loop will take approximately 30-35 minutes.

John Farley, Golden Gate Park Area Supervisor, reported that the route connects to many of the major features in Golden Gate Park without having too many stops. The route does not interfere with the Sunday closures on JFK Drive and is therefore routed on Middle Drive and MLK. There are several connections to MUNI for people to connect at several different places. He expressed that the department is open to make changes as deemed necessary throughout the evaluation process during the pilot program. Mr. Farley reported that RecPark is in full support of the shuttle.

Mr. Lazarus asked about the environmental impact of the shuttle and how the authority is handling disabled passengers. CEO Ellzey replied that the pilot program is not necessarily reflective of the rolling stock that will be used in the permanent program, which staff expects will be a clean air program. Mr. Marciano reported that of the four vehicles that are currently being used for the pilot, one vehicle is ADA. After Labor Day there will be at least one more ADA vehicle available for use. CEO Ellzey assured the Authority that the final, long-term program would be environmental program, entirely

ADA compliant, and staff expects to be using CNG vehicles. CEO Ellzey added that the Mayor's office on disability would be notified of the intentions for future programs.

Mr. John Laskin asked who was paying for the shuttle program and the coinciding public relations events. He also asked about funding for EIR. CEO Ellzey replied that under Proposition J, the Authority has received $150,000 as the first installment toward $1.55 million that goes toward the implementation of transit, transportation, and parking improvements. The funds necessary and expended for the implementation of this shuttle program come from those private, philanthropic funds.

Mr. Chris Duderstadt asked for confirmation that the shuttles were to be free. He said that the ADA compliant drop-off for the N-Judah is at Judah and 9th Avenue, not at Irving and 9th Avenue.

Mr. Phil Carleton from the Alliance for Golden Gate Park, asked about the environmental review process. He wanted to know if a list of the groups for the scoping announcement is available. Mr. Rice from EIP replied that one of the early steps in the EIR process is notice of preparation for the Planning Department and informing the public, community groups and other agencies that an EIR is underway so that comments can be taken. That notice should go out in a couple of months. The distribution list is developed with the Planning Department and attempts to be as inclusive as possible. No such list is available at this time.

Mr. Carleton suggested that an indication of the speed limit in Golden Gate Park be posted on the shuttle vehicles to remind people that the speed limit in Golden Gate Park is 25mph.

Ms. Pinky Kushner said that there is a preferable ADA stop at UCSF parking garage. She agreed with the previous speaker and would like to see a 25mph sign. The Inner-Sunset Park Neighbors have also been very concerned about cars passing buses in the neighborhood and in the park. She suggested not only 25mph signage, but also flashing lights so the cars won't speed around it. She further commented that the EIR take into account all of the projects in the concourse area.

**4. SELECTION OF SWINERTON BUILDERS AS CONSTRUCTION MANAGER/GENERAL CONTRACTOR FOR THE PROJECT**

CEO Ellzey recommended that the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority select Swinerton Builders as prime consultant and construction manager/general contractor to oversee pre-construction, construction management and general contractor services for the project, and that the he be authorized to negotiate and execute an agreement with Swinerton Builders for pre-construction services.

CEO Ellzey reported that in August 2000 this board had approved a contracting policy which was negotiated closely with HRC under the advisement of the City Attorney's office. Under that policy, the CEO was enabled to select five prime consultants using private funds in order to get the project up and running and advise the Authority through the course of the project. Four of the five were selected soon there after-- Gordon H. Chong & Partners as project architect; MCK Associates as project advisor, Public

Affairs Management as the community relations firm, and EIP as the environmental review firm.

CEO Ellzey asked that the Authority select Swinerton Builders as the prime consultant and construction manager/general contractor to oversee preconstruction. Swinerton Builders has been identified as the premium potential partner for services for the project. Swinerton is already serving in a similar capacity with the de Young and it is expected that the Authority will therefore realize significant savings.

Mr. Graziano introduced Swinerton Builders and referred the Authority to the company profile contained in their packets. He spoke briefly about the preconstruction phase of the project to be conducted over the next 12 months.

CEO Ellzey added the Swinerton Builders comes highly recommended and has an extensive body of work in and around San Francisco as well as on-going partnerships with Gordon H. Chong & Partners.

There was some discussion to clarify some of the language in Swinerton's Statement of Qualifications. Director Lazarus was concerned that Swinerton was a busy company and asked how other projects would fit into the timeline of the Authority's project. Mr. Graziano acknowledged that there is a slowdown in the economy and not unlike any other contractor, they look ahead one year and in that forecast the Authority's project fits quite well.

Mr. John Laskin commented that he hopes that the construction site will be safe and those who have lost their lives on dangerous jobs should be remembered.

Mr. Chris Duderstadt asked if there would be a bid package going out for this contract. CEO Ellzey replied that the design and construction of the underground parking facility is a privately funded project and in accordance with that it is considered under the proposition to be a non-public work. Therefore, the approved contracting policy does not require the Authority to enter into a competitive process to select prime consultants.

There being no further public comment, a motion was duly made, seconded and it was **RESOLVED** to authorize the CEO to negotiate and execute an agreement with Swinerton Builders for preconstruction services. The motion carried unanimously.

**5. APPROVAL OF A LETTER AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY INITIATIVES FUND AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

CEO Ellzey gave some background of the evolution of the letter agreement over the past several months to enter into a relationship that defines the rights and obligations and entitlements of the respective parties. He then entertained questions from the public and the Board regarding the letter agreement and announced that a special meeting will convene within the next couple of weeks in order to approve and subsequently execute the agreement.

Director Rizzo encouraged the Authority to give the public another opportunity to comment at the special meeting after they have had more time the review the Agreement.

Mr. Laskin wanted it to be better clarified in the letter agreement who was paying who. It seemed unclear in the agreement. CEO Ellzey clarified the flow of the funds. Director Lazarus added that the agreement is a non-binding letter of understanding to advance the project at every step prior to construction.

Ms. Pinky Kushner commented that the public is having a hard time understanding the document and urged the Authority to consider a "non-legalese" statement that would better explain the agreement in terms of what was voted for in Proposition J. She also expressed some concern that the document appears to limit the amount of private funds expected for the project. CEO Ellzey assured Ms. Kushner that the letter agreement is in full compliance with Proposition J.

Ms. Susan King representing the San Francisco Green Party, reported that they are strongly opposed to Proposition J. She expressed concerns regarding the apparent gap in the funding for the garage and for the PCL proposal that is considering a $25 million gift to the garage project that seems to be in conflict with the proposition. She is also concerned about the pedestrian tunnels and generally believes that the public has been duped by Proposition J. In response to Ms. King's allegations, CEO Ellzey made the following remarks. He acknowledged that there is a funding gap and that it will be resolved using private funds. He said that the Concourse would not be destroyed, but improved. The preferred design alternative does not destroy the Concourse and only constructs beneath paved roadways. He reiterated that the garage would be designed and constructed entirely with private funds. The dedicated entrance that originates from outside the park is an integral part of the design. The pedestrian oasis will be achieved by removing all of the parking from the surface of the Concourse area and moving it underground. The parking spaces above ground would be replaced with softscape. If the pedestrian tunnels cannot be retained as they are, they will be reconstructed, if feasible. In any event, a pedestrian linkage is assured. The PCL bond could and would be used for public projects listed in Proposition J that are not necessarily to be privately funded. Those projects include the enhancements to the Concourse area relating to transportation plans and "transit first" improvements. It is the responsibility of the Authority the secure funding to accomplish those other projects.

Mr. Steve Willis, member of the San Francisco Green Party, Transportation Working Group, Walk SF and the Alliance for Golden Gate Park, wanted to go on record in supporting the development an auto-free oasis in the Concourse area. He also would like to go on record that he opposes the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority design choice. He then brought up issues raised above regarding the PCL funds and the use of public vs. private funds to which CEO Ellzey responded.

Mr. Phil Carleton from the Alliance for Golden Gate Park, encouraged the Board to consider this letter agreement very thoughtfully. He asked for a change in the document regarding the apparent limitation on philanthropic funds. He would like the term "all reasonable funds" in lieu of the limit of $40 million. He asked for more specificity regarding efforts to assist CIF on page six, section five.

Mr. Christopher Duderstadt commented on the EIR for the de Young Museum and suggested that there are direct conflicts with what the Planning Department has approved.

Ms. Katherine Roberts from the Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council and the Green Party Transportation Working Group, commented that HANC historically opposes any development in Golden Gate Park. She is concerned about the cumulative projects that will be going on in the Park and the effect will be monumental. She encouraged that the EIR for the garage project examine the cumulative effect of all projects.

There being no further public testimony, on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously approved it was **RESOLVED** to continue this item at a special meeting, as the President deems necessary.

**6. AUTHORIZATION EXTENSION OF PROJECT AGREEMENTS WITH SELECTED CONSULTANTS FOR AN ADDITIONAL ONE YEAR TO COMPLETE THE "DESIGN AND APPROVAL" PHASE OF THE PROJECT.**

CEO Ellzey requested that the Board of Directors defer this item in connection with item 5 for a special meeting.

Ms. Pinky Kushner requested a week or ten days notice for the special meeting to be assured that everyone who wants to come can be at the meeting.

One motion duly made, seconded and unanimously approved, it was **RESOLVED** to continue this item at a special meeting.

**7. DIRECTORS' BUSINESS:**

**This item allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items.**

Director Lazarus reported that due to his candidacy for City Attorney and as per the policies of the Mayor, he has offered his resignation. However, due to the temporary shortage of directors on the current Board, the date of that resignation will be effective only at the discretion of the Mayor. He then thanked the Authority and encouraged that the project move forward and that ultimately the public will be well served by this project.

**8. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Christopher Duderstadt wanted clarification of a document and CEO Ellzey said that he would provide it.

**9. ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

F
45
1
8/27/01
2

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
Tammy Haygood
James L. Lazarus
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

**NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING**
**Monday, August 27, 2001**
**3:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 416**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF A LETTER AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY INITIATIVES FUND AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO.** The CEO may request authorization to execute, on behalf of the Authority, a letter agreement between the Community Initiatives Fund, a California non-profit public benefit corporation ("CIF") and the City and County of San Francisco, acting by and through the Authority, related to a schedule and budget not to exceed $5,640,000 for professional services activities to be accomplished during the "Design and Approval" phase of the project. **(POSSIBLE ACTION)**

3. **AUTHORIZE EXTENSION OF PROJECT AGREEMENTS WITH SELECTED CONSULTANTS FOR AN ADDITIONAL ONE YEAR TO COMPLETE THE "DESIGN AND APPROVAL" PHASE OF THE PROJECT.** The CEO will request that the Board of Directors authorize an extension of existing consulting agreements for an additional one year for the purpose of completing the "Design and Approval Phase" of the project. The project phases and scope of work to be performed in the Design and Approval Phase are generally described in the Letter Agreement to be executed between the Community Initiatives Fund and the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority. **(POSSIBLE ACTION)**

4. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

AUG 2 3 2001

08-23-01A09:53 R

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2727**
**Fax: (415) 831-2099**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

SF
G45
#2
8/27/01
special

OCT 10 2001
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

# FINAL MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 27, 2001 SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A special meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on August 27, 2001 at 3:30 p.m. in Room 416, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

## 1. ROLL CALL:

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, Jim Lazarus, John Lum, and John Rizzo. Stephanie MacColl and Margaret O'Sullivan were absent. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 3:49 p.m.

## 2. APPROVAL OF A LETTER AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY INITIATIVES FUND AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO:

President Conner made some introductory remarks that linked the letter of understanding with the spirit and letter of Proposition J. Her introductory remarks included the history of how the proposition evolved, along with the desire of many San Franciscans, for the museums to stay in the park and the need for an assurance that parking would be available for families, seniors and regional visitors. To that end, a funder came forward and offered to raise private funds to build a garage. However, the garage is only one part of the proposition. The balance of the proposition is to affect transportation and surface improvements in and around the Park, as well as the concept of a pedestrian oasis. These things will happen. Another element of Proposition J is the administration costs—costs to support the public side of these projects.

The letter agreement is to define who is responsible for which element as outlined in Proposition J—the garage, transportation improvements, surface improvements, and the administration of each. The funders are committed to fund the garage and $1.55 million activation fund for transportation improvements. The letter agreement does not limit their commitment, but rather attempts to define what is and is not garage related. The letter agreement proposes a 60/40 split in the cost of operations and a desire to find funding for improved transportation solutions and park surface improvements. To that end, public funds are consistent with certain voter expectations. Golden Gate Park will be greatly improved if the Authority leverages this considerable private investment with justifiable public dollars.

CEO Ellzey provided some additional background on the letter agreement and requested authorization to execute, on behalf of the Authority, the agreement between the Community Initiatives Fund, a California non-profit public benefit corporation ("CIF") and the City and County of San Francisco, acting by the through the Authority, related to a schedule and budget not to exceed $5,640,000 for professional services activities to be accomplished during the "Design and Approval" phase of the project.

CEO Ellzey welcomed any comments from the public and the board at this time.

Director Rizzo asked that the purpose of the letter agreement be clearly stated in simple language and to outline what it is that this letter will achieve for the Authority and the

funders. CEO Ellzey stated that it is intended to define the rights, entitlements and obligations of the respective parties. This means that there is a term assigned to the agreement. Effectively, the Authority is trying to enter into an arrangement with the funding partners to cover the "design and approval" phase of the Project. The letter defines what is to be covered during that phase of the project; specifically, the scope of work and budget. Secondly, the funding commitment of the Community Initiatives Fund is defined, including the operational costs, transportation implementation funds, and various phases of the project. Thirdly, the City intention is defined including operations budget, transportation improvement programs, and surface enhancements beyond reconstruction.

Director Lazarus added that this letter agreement began as a contract and therefore much of that language comes through in the letter. While the Authority is still defining its funding package, this letter intends to get the Authority through the year until the construction phase of the project begins. This letter agreement will get the Authority through the permitting process and construction documents phase. A permanent MOU and funding agreement will supersede this letter agreement.

Mr. David Spero commented that, in his opinion, this letter agreement is premature considering the shortfall in the cost of the project. He asked for the City's commitment to expand the service of the N-Judah, encourages people to use mass transit, and wants to see more money spent on transportation and less on the garage. CEO replied that the Authority is making progress with its transportation program and recognizes that it is in need of improvement. The Authority also expects to begin negotiations with MUNI for improvements to MUNI services, which would include the N-Judah. Secondly, CEO Ellzey cautions against considering the $60 million cost of the garage as a fixed figure. The costing is something that is constantly being analyzed as the project moves along.

Mr. Chris Duderstadt read from Proposition J for the record: Section 1, paragraph 9 reads "The Underground Parking Facility shall be constructed entirely with funds received through one or more philanthropic donations." Section 7, "The Authority shall construct or cause the Underground Parking Facility to be constructed with private funds. No public funds shall be used in the construction of the Underground Parking Facility ...except in such condition as it results in a cost savings to the City & County." Section 13, paragraph 1, "It is the intent of the People of the City & County of San Francisco in adopting this ordinance that the Underground Parking Faculty shall be designed and constructed in an expeditious manner with private funds." In the letter agreement it says, "CIF will use its reasonable efforts to raise up to $40 million dollars in philanthropic funds to be donated to support the project costs." He went on to comment on the estimate for the preferred alternative of $60,599,000, which doesn't include the restoration of the pedestrian tunnels. He cautioned that this letter agreement concedes that there will only be $40 million to build this garage and for this there is cause for concern.

Director Lazarus responded that the estimate from a few years ago reflects the commitment initially made by the donors. It is clear now that the costs will be somewhere between $40 and $60 million. The ballot measure allows the Authority to incur debt. Like many of the City's garages that are built by revenue bond debt, the

users of the garage and not the tax-payers of San Francisco pay them. There will be some, yet to be determined, form of debt financing that will fund the shortfall—not to be paid with taxpayer money.

Director Rizzo concurred that it is a huge leap to say that $20 million will be paid for by public funds. He emphasized that that would be illegal under the proposition and the City Attorney would not let the Authority enter into an agreement that stipulated that public funds would be used for this garage. The agreements simply states that the funders are agreeing to a certain amount at this time. It does not imply that the rest will come from public funds.

Mr. John Laskin asked whether there were any members of the media present. There were none. He feels as though the Authority's project is a theft of parking spaces for recreational users in the eastern end of the Park and that the parking spaces are given over to the museums. He hopes that the Board of Supervisors will deny approval of revenue bonds for the garage.

There being no further comment, a motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved and it was **RESOLVED** that the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority authorize the Chief Executive Officer to finalize and execute, and cause to have executed by the parties, a letter agreement between the City and County of San Francisco, acting by and through the Concourse Authority, and the Music Concourse and Garage Fund of the Community Initiative Funds for the purpose of securing professional services necessary to conduct the design and approval phase of the project to construct an Underground Parking Facility as required by Proposition J.

### 3. Authorize Extension of Project Agreements with Selected Consultants for an Additional One Year to Complete the "Design and Approval" Phase of the Project.

The CEO requested that the Board of Directors authorize an extension of existing consulting agreements for an additional one year for the purpose of completing the "Design and Approval Phase" of the project. The project phases and scope of work to be performed in the Design and Approval Phase are generally described in the Letter Agreement to be executed between the Community Initiatives Fund and the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority.

CEO Ellzey made some brief comments regarding the extensions as they are described in the LOU as terms and conditions of the extended agreements. The agreements are anticipated to be one year or as such time it would be necessary to complete the "design and approval" phase, not more than 12 months. It is expected that new agreements will be executed in connection with an MOU that would supersede this letter agreement. CEO Ellzey recommended that the extended agreements be authorized.

Director Lazarus clarified that the contracts are the same contracts that were approved of in the short term and now because there is a funding source identified, the Authority is able to enter into 12 month agreements to move through the architectural, environmental, and other aspects of the program as described in the letter agreement.

There being no further comment, a motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved and it was **RESOLVED** to authorize an extension of the existing consultant agreements for an additional one year for the purpose of completing the "design and approval phase" of the project.

## 4. Directors' Business:

**This item allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items.**

Director Lazarus reported that the Mayor has not yet given a date for his resignation but it is still pending due to his candidacy for City Attorney. He then took a moment to reflect on his term as Director on the Board of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and extol the virtues of Proposition J.

## 5. Public Comment

Mr. John Laskin commented that the Revitalization Act is despicable. The garage project will not generate any revenue for the department and may not generate enough to pay off its own bonds. He feels that his hatred for the project is fully justified.

Chris Duderstadt had a question about a document, which was unfamiliar to the staff and Board.

## 6. Adjournment:

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Douglas Moran
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

SEP 12 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, September 11, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 14, 2001.
**(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT.** The President of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority will introduce Mr. Douglas Moran as a newly appointed member of the Board of Directors.

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

**Project Overview**. The CEO will provide a summary overview of the Authority's project activities, including an update of the design and approval phase of the underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

**Intra-park Shuttle Implementation Plan Update.** The CEO will provide an update on the Intra-Park Shuttle Pilot Program, which commenced operation on August 18.

5. **DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY'S TRANSPORATION ACTION PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION.** The Chair, members of the Board, staff, consultants and the public will engage in a discussion of the Draft Transportation Action Plan for Implementation. In accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act, a Transportation Feasibility Study has been submitted to the Board. A Draft implementation plan has been prepared for evaluation. The purpose of this discussion will be to discuss in broader detail the Section 8 Transportation Action Plan programs being developed by the Authority and priorities for implementation.
**(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2727**
**Fax: (415) 831-2099**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

SF
G45
#1
9/11/01
canceled
c.2

From: Julia_Kay@ci.sf.ca.us
Date: Tue, 11 Sep 2001 11:54:37 -0700
Subject: Concourse Authority Meeting Canceled
To: Theresa_Alvarez@ci.sf.ca.us, Linda_Avery@ci.sf.ca.us,
Becky_Ballinger@ci.sf.ca.us, Board_of_Supervisors@ci.sf.ca.us,
Cal_Broomhead@ci.sf.ca.us, Tim_Chee@ci.sf.ca.us, David_Chan@sfcta.org,
Bayard_Fong@ci.sf.ca.us, David_Hochschild@ci.sf.ca.us,
Gary_Hoy@ci.sf.ca.us, Jose_Luis_Moscovich@sfcta.org,
Steve_Kawa@ci.sf.ca.us, Shannon_Maloney@ci.sf.ca.us,
Paul_Maltzer@ci.sf.ca.us, Margaret_McArthur@ci.sf.ca.us,
Robert_McDonald@ci.sf.ca.us, Jake_McGoldrick@ci.sf.ca.us,
Mariam_Morley@ci.sf.ca.us, Mark_Palmer@ci.sf.ca.us,
Audrey_W._Pearson@ci.sf.ca.us, Diane_Perez@ci.sf.ca.us,
Carol_Roos@ci.sf.ca.us, John_Ruppert@ci.sf.ca.us,
terryg@sfpl.lib.ca.us, Richard_Thall@ci.sf.ca.us,
Yvonne_Wimmleitner@ci.sf.ca.us, Leland_Yee@ci.sf.ca.us,
Monica_Zanetti@ci.sf.ca.us

Please be advised that the regular meeting of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority scheduled for today, September 11, 2001 has been canceled.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

SEP 12 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

/91
SF
S45
1
0/9/01

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Douglas Moran
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

OCT - 5 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, October 9. 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 14, 2001 and the Special Meeting of August 27, 2001. **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **PRESIDENT'S REPORT.** The President of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority will introduce Mr. Douglas Moran as a newly appointed member of the Board of Directors.

4. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

**Project Overview**. The CEO will provide a summary overview of the Authority's project activities, including an update of the design and approval phase of the underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

**Intra-park Shuttle Implementation Plan Update.** The CEO will provide an update on the Intra-Park Shuttle Pilot Program, which commenced operation on August 18.

5. **DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY'S TRANSPORATION ACTION PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION.** The Chair, members of the Board, staff, consultants and the public will engage in a discussion of the Draft Transportation Action Plan for Implementation. In accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act, a Transportation Feasibility Study has been submitted to the Board. A Draft implementation plan has been prepared for evaluation. The purpose of this discussion will be to discuss in broader detail the Section 8 Transportation Action Plan programs being developed by the Authority and priorities for implementation. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

6. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2727**
**Fax: (415) 831-2099**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

SF
45
2
10/9/01

# Minutes of the October 9, 2001 Meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority, a California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on October 9th, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

## 1. Roll Call:

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, Douglas Moran, Margaret O'Sullivan and John Rizzo. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

## 2. Approval of the Minutes:

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 14, 2001 and the Special Meeting of August 27, 2001.

## 3. President's Report

President Conner introduced the new Concourse Authority's Board Member, Douglas Moran. He is a purchasing administrator for the University of California at San Francisco from District 11.

## 4. Chief Executive Officer's Report:

**Project Overview**

CEO Ellzey provided a summary overview of the Authority's project activities, including an update of the design and approval phase of the underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

CEO Ellzey spoke briefly about the occurrences over the past two months, as the Authority was unable to meet as scheduled on September 11th. He gave an update on the status of the letter agreement. The letter agreement will bring the Authority through the design and approval phase of the project, which is approximately one year in duration with a budget of $5.64 million. He reported that on October 18th the second installment of the $1.55 million for transportation implementation funding in the amount of $200,000 would be eligible to be set aside.

The environmental evaluation application was filed on September 17th. This means that the environmental review process has formally begun. Over the next 10 to 14 days it is expected that a meeting for the purpose of a discussing with the Planning Department the breadth of the environmental evaluation as a part of the Proposition J projects.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

NOV 19 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

The schematic design process has gotten underway and the consultants are working with staff to refine cost estimates on the preferred design alternative for the garage project. The next round of stakeholder meetings is currently being planned.

**Intra-park Shuttle Implementation Plan Update**

Ms. Marilyn Duffey from the Duffey Company provided an update on the Intra-Park Shuttle Pilot Program, which commenced operation on August 18, 2001 and will conclude at the end of October. Ms. Duffey reported that the shuttle is operating with a lot of enthusiasm and the passenger surveys show positive responses, yet a broader audience needs to be reached.

All of the vehicles are now ADA accessible. Many of the shuttles are motorized cable cars and have proven to be very popular, but a distinguished image needs to be developed so that everybody will be able to recognize the shuttle. Ms. Duffey reported that she would provide a summary for the Authority at next month's meeting after the Pilot Program has concluded.

Director O'Sullivan asked about sharing funding for the shuttle with other attractions in the Park. Ms. Duffey replied that there is already widespread interest from the institutions for next year's pilot program.

Director Rizzo commented that, as a passenger, the experience of riding the shuttle was a good one. Director Lum asked about the current marketing program. Ms. Duffey reported that the staff has been working with the institutions and Park event planners to take advantage of co-advertising in the newspapers and programs for various events. Ms. Kristy Ranieri from Public Affairs Management added that ads have been running in the *SF Weekly* and the *Bay Guardian* for the past three weeks. Public Affairs Management has been making short presentations at various associations throughout the city to inform people about the shuttle and have been successful at securing links to their websites. They have been passing out maps and posters around the city.

Mr. Chris Duderstadt asked that the Authority have a financial statement on the cost of the shuttle. He also had concerns that the changes in the letter agreement would have an impact on the Authority's projects. CEO Ellzey replied that the private funders are funding 100% of the shuttle. No public money is being used for that program. Regarding the letter agreement, the modifications were minor and in favor of the City. That agreement has been available for review on the website since prior to August 27.

Mr. John Laskin commented that the employees at UCSF use the Park for parking. They will be impacted by the implementation of the Authority's parking management programs. Therefore, UCSF must be properly notified that these programs will be forthcoming. Mr. Laskin has concerns that Warren Hellman is creating a monopoly parking business and the project is negatively affecting the neighborhood. He also has concerns that there will be no place to park during hospital emergencies.

Mr. Carleton asked if there were any plans to put speed limit signs on the shuttles. He suggested that some of the shuttles themselves appeared to be traveling at over 25mph. Mr. Carleton would like to hear more about traffic calming in the CEO's report and he advocates more enforcement of the traffic laws.

**5. DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY'S TRANSPORTATION ACTION PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION.**

The Chair, members of the Board, staff, consultants and the public engaged in a discussion of the Draft Transportation Action Plan for Implementation. In accordance with Section 8 of the Golden Gate Park Revitalization Act, a Transportation Feasibility Study has been submitted to the Board. A Draft implementation plan has been prepared for evaluation. The purpose of this discussion is to discuss in broader detail the Section 8 Transportation Action Plan programs being developed by the Authority and priorities for implementation.

CEO Ellzey made some introductory remarks and reviewed the main elements of Proposition J including Section 8. Proposition J allows for a total of up to $1.55 million as a gift for the implementation of the Section 8 programs. The Authority will need to prioritize these funds and leverage that which is available with other City departments and partners that may assist the Authority in implementing full and enduring programs. The Duffey Company has completed a Transportation Action Plan as required in Section 8 and the purpose of this item is to begin a discussion for a prioritization framework.

President Conner added that the implementation plan for action that is being discussed is for one year for which the Authority has $350,000 to make the greatest impact to achieve the following goals---to decrease the presence of the automobile and increase access to the Park by other transportation means.

Ms. Marilyn Duffey of the Duffey Company facilitated an interactive discussion of the implementation plan among those in the audience and the Board, inviting ideas and suggestions from everyone. The Draft Matrix of the Transportation Action Plan was made available for public review and is on the website.

#1. The IntraPark Shuttle Pilot Program: The shuttle pilot program will have concluded by the end of October. There will be a full report on the success of the Pilot Program at next month's regular board meeting. In preparation for the next pilot in the spring, there will be a working group meeting with the participants who had helped form the first program in order to discuss ideas on how to improve the program. There is adequate money for the pilot program from the Transportation Authority and the Concourse Authority budget to carry the program into the next year.

There was some feedback from the Brian Edgar, Operation's Manager of Coach USA, regarding his suggestions for improvement.

Mr. John Laskin commented that he is against parking space removal for any reason. He asked if Proposition J stated that the shuttle would be free or paid for by

the garage fees. President Conner replied that the Proposition only states that the Authority create an Intra-Park Shuttle.

Mr. Chris Duderstadt asked that priority be given for the use of clean air vehicles. He asked if dogs would be allowed onto the shuttle. Brian Edgar replied that animals are allowed on board at the discretion of the driver, as well as companion animals.

Director Lum suggested that there might be opportunity to share resources with other shuttle programs when purchasing vehicles. He asked of the viability of there being a free shuttle in the Park. Ms. Duffey said that a free shuttle is key in the beginning in order to build ridership without discouraging people from using it.

Director Rizzo believes that a free shuttle would encourage people to leave their cars behind when coming out to the Park.

President Conner acknowledged the need for future planning regarding the costs of the permanent program. Ms. Duffey replied that there is already money in the budget for future planning.

Phil Carleton asked that 25mph signs be displayed on the shuttles.

#2 Parking Management: Ms. Duffey gave some introductory remarks regarding the Parking Management Plan including parking displacement actions and time-limited parking that would discourage non-Park, commuter usage throughout the Park. She reported that Wilbur Smith Associates has completed the comprehensive survey of parking spaces in the Park and that study will be presented at next month's meeting. There are a series of stakeholder meetings being planned that will go over all of the proposals for the elimination of parking spaces. Much importance should be placed on the timing of implementing parking space removal. Some things may have to wait until the garage is built. There may be some parking spaces removed prior to the completion of the garage for safety reasons. Other Section 8 projects will require the removal of parking spaces and therefor the Authority would be expected to remove them in association with certain programs; for example, traffic calming measures which require the narrowing of roadways.

Doug Nelson, who had worked extensively on the Golden Gate Park Master Plan, commented that the time restrictions could be implemented now as this plan has already been through extensive public review.

Director Rizzo suggested that there be a separate action item for the Section 8 portions that are part of the Golden Gate Park Master Plan and held out as a separate component.

Mr. John Laskin wants to see more consideration for park users who are the stakeholders.

Mr. Phil Carleton questioned the need to notice the institutions prior to implementation of timed parking.

Mr. Duderstadt wants "human powered" vehicles to be considered when making these decisions.

Mary Anne Miller asked about the relationship between the EIR and Transportation Actions for Implementation. She feels the EIR should be done prior to implementing any of these actions. Ms. Duffey explained that most of the actions were already addressed in the EIR in conjunction with the Golden Gate Park Master Plan. Mr. Michael Rice from EIP Associates further explained the process of the Environmental Review process to Ms. Miller. CEO Ellzey acknowledged that Ms. Miller raises a good point and that the process is a challenging one. Director Lum added that many of these improvements are pro-environmental and should continue to move forward unless there are new environmental issues raised. All of these improvements help to further define the project that will ultimately be useful for an EIR.

#3 Traffic Calming: Ms. Duffey reported that this item recommends testing changeable speed signs, landscape improvements, shared-use roadway. Pre-design recommendations will be brought before the board and will include several design options.

President Conner asked for reports from the Richmond Police station on traffic violations and safety report. CEO Ellzey said that he would arrange for that report.

Mr. John Laskin commented on the landscape bulbouts and landscape extensions. He felt that it will ultimately be harmful to the park users as they will hinder the "human powered" vehicles. Ms. Duffey replied that the Authority has met with several agencies for input regarding these issues. Mr. Laskin said to include David Miles and Chris Duderstadt when asking for input.

Director Moran asked about WBE/MBE when hiring any outside consultants. CEO Ellzey referred him to the Contracting Policy that was approved by this board in August 2000, which required all subcontractors to meet WBE/MBE levels.

Director MacColl asked if implementation of each action is in the budget for next year, as they all seem to be priorities. CEO Ellzey replied that there is $350,000 that will appropriated to the plan through October 2002. The CEO is comfortable that there will be enough funds to coordinate all of these actions within the next year.

Mr. Phil Carleton suggested speed bumps that will lower for emergency vehicles. He feels that those would be better than bulbouts that are dangerous to skaters and bicycle riders. Ms. Duffey reported that studies through DPT show landscaped bulbouts to be more effective than speed bumps.

Mr. Duderstadt commented that DPW had commented at a recent Richmond neighborhood meeting that parking was the most valid form of traffic calming.

Ms. Mary Anne Miller reminded that the narrowing of roadways is part of the Golden Gate Park Master Plan.

#4 Pedestrian Safety: Ms. Duffey proposed either pedestrian crossing signs that are in the new florescent green or the new ladder markings at crosswalks. RecPark will have the ultimate say in which would be placed inside the Park and at which locations. Pedestrian safety has been separated out from bicyclists and skaters as suggested, because the public felt them to be discreet items.

CEO Ellzey commented that RecPark does not look favorably at pedestrian signals in the Park. There may be no need for such expenditure. There will be further discussions on this particular item.

Mr. Laskin commented that he advocates stop signs, as they are most useful for those who choose to drive to the Park and will provide safety for those who use the crosswalks. He reiterated his disapproval for the removal of parking spaces, however, in the belief that it does nothing to improve pedestrian safety.

Mr. Carleton encouraged the Authority to put signs at the crosswalks. He asked about the flashing crosswalks that are in place in front of City Hall and if a similar setup would work as an effective alternative for Golden Gate Park.

Mr. Duderstadt would like to see a pedestrian right-of-way on the eastern end of the Concourse area.

Ms. Duffey added that there are no pedestrian sidewalks along Lincoln and could use improvement by MUNI for their patrons who are waiting for buses or disembarking.

#5 Bicycle and Skating Improvements: The Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority continues to work with RecPark, DPT and the Bicycle Coalition in implementing the San Francisco Bicycle Plan and Golden Gate Park Master Plan bicycle improvements. The plan is to improve the North/South connection with bike lanes that are well marked throughout the Park. The Bicycle Coalition, bicycle stakeholders and visitors in the Park will need to be included in the concept design so that all needs will be met.

Director Rizzo commented that, during his discussions with the Bicycle Coalition, it has become clear that their goal is to install new bicycle trails in the Park that will become a part of a Citywide network of bicycle lanes. This should be taken into account when making the transportation improvements. CEO Ellzey will ask the Bicycle Coalition to make a formal recommendation to the Authority that will include this network and invite them into any further discussions.

#6 Road Closures: Ms. Duffey reported that RecPark had identified several road closures in the Master Plan. The department will continue to pursue those. The Concourse Authority will be working with RecPark to make sure that those closures do not preclude the operation of the internal shuttle. An analysis of the closure of

JFK on Saturdays and the implications of Saturday closure to the garage will be included as part of the EIR. The Authority may consider road closures around the Concourse as part of the design concepts for the garage. For example, 8th Avenue vs. 10th Avenue will be studied as the major access road into Golden Gate Park.

CEO Ellzey reported that the General Manager has approached him from RecPark and the department has requested assistance from the Authority in implementing some of the road closures that are defined in the Master Plan.

Mr. Laskin commented that road closures would make it all the more difficult for the cars to get into the garage.

President Conner asked for clarification of RecPark's recommended closure of Conservatory Drive East. It was her understanding that that particular closure has been temporarily taken off pending the completion of the conservation of the Conservatory. CEO Ellzey replied that he would look into that. Ms. Duffey added that the Authority is not recommending that particular closure and that perhaps it should be re-worded.

President Conner would like to see the implications of the removal of parking spaces on the operation of the IntraPark Shuttle, especially as it links to the northern transit stops.

Director Rizzo asked when RecPark plans to make closures. CEO Ellzey said that the next step is to bring these clients and partners in to talk about beginning implementation schedules.

#7 Cultural Shuttle: The Cultural Shuttle has been discussed extensively. The recommendation is to conduct focus group surveys to see whether or not there is an interest. The shuttle would go outside of the park and meet up with transit nodes such as Caltrain and Bart, and then bring visitors to the Park. Over the next year the Authority should develop some cost estimates and funding feasibility. This is a very high-ticket item. Future consideration would be to expand the shuttle to link with other attractions around San Francisco. As an alternative action, the Authority could team up with MUNI to enhance existing transit service and visibility for lines serving Golden Gate Park using marketing and logo identity for buses and stops.

CEO Ellzey commented that his initial response is that to have the Cultural Shuttle running by next year is overly optimistic. Such a program would be difficult to implement and currently the focus should be strictly on feasibility work. The MUNI partnership seems feasible. Director Rizzo added that alternative funding partners for the Cultural Shuttle should be sought out.

Ms. Duffey reported that there have been discussions with the Presidio Trust and they are interested in linking Golden Gate Park with their shuttle. They would like to work cooperatively with Golden Gate Park and the Concourse Authority.

#8 MUNI Improvements: Ms. Duffey reported, that at a recent meeting with MUNI, they were told that the 44 O'Shaughnessy will become part of MUNI's changeable bus sign program and will flash "Golden Gate Park" on its way to the Park Park. This should be implemented by the first of the year.

MUNI has agreed to pursue the other items on the Transportation Action Plan including map and signage improvements, and promoting Golden Gate Park in a different way. She reported that MUNI had placed bus cards promoting the Shuttle pilot in all of their buses without charge. MUNI is a real cooperative partner.

Mr. Carleton asked if the Authority could ask MUNI to have their changeable sign flash a 25mph speed limit as it goes through the Park. The 25mph limit could be emphasized in MUNI marketing.

Having concluded the discussion of the action plan, President Conner recognized that, with the exception of the Cultural Shuttle, every action is a priority. Ms. Duffey suggested that parking management, traffic calming, pedestrian safety and bicycle improvements all tie together and the Authority might consider those actions to be a priority.

## 6. Directors' Business:

**This item allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items.**

As previously discussed, the Bicycle Coalition will be invited to come to a meeting for a presentation to the Authority.

## 7. Public Comment

Ms. Miller asked if the members of the Community Workshops groups could become de facto members of the stakeholders groups.

Mr. Laskin opined that the stakeholders are those who use the Park and, to some extent, the taxpayers.

Mr. Duderstadt suggested the Authority secure another meeting room with the capacity for graphics presentations.

Mr. Carleton wanted confirmation that SPEAK, the Inner Sunset Neighbor, and the Alliance for Golden Gate Park were on the stakeholder list.

## 8. Adjournment:

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Douglas Moran
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

DOCUMENTS DEPT.
NOV 13 2001
SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING**
**Tuesday, November 13, 2001**
**4:30 P.M.**
**CITY HALL, ROOM 408**

**AGENDA**

1. **ROLL CALL**

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Discussion and possible action to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 9, 2001 **(ACTION ITEM)**

3. **CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

Project Overview. The CEO will provide a summary overview of the Authority's project activities, including an update of the design and approval phase of the underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

4. **INTRA-PARK SHUTTLE PILOT PROGRAM – FINAL REPORT (YEAR ONE).** The Duffey Company, transportation consultants to the Authority, will present the final report on the first year of the two-year intra-park shuttle pilot program.

5. **ACCEPTANCE OF A GIFT-IN-KIND FOR OPERATIONS AND SERVICES RENDERED IN CONNECTION WITH YEAR ONE OF THE TWO-YEAR INTRA-PARK SHUTTLE PILOT PROGRAM.** The CEO will recommend that the Concourse Authority board of directors accept a gift-in-kind in the amount of $113,000, which reflects total expenditures for services and operations for the first year of the intra-park shuttle pilot program. **(ACTION ITEM)**

6. **RECEIVE AND ACCEPT THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY EIR TRANSPORTATION DATA COLLECTION (PARKING - EXISTING CONDITIONS) STUDY.** The CEO will recommend that the Concourse Authority board of directors accept the "existing conditions" parking study as the "baseline" parking space inventory from which parking spaces removed from Golden Gate Park pursuant to the provisions of Proposition J will be subtracted. **(ACTION ITEM)**

7. **APPROVE PROGRAM AND BUDGET FOR TRANSPORTATION ACTION PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTATION FOR FISCAL 2002.** The CEO will recommend that the Concourse Authority board of directors approve a resolution which sets forth a budget and program for transportation improvement programs to be implemented pursuant to the Golden Gate Park Master Plan and the provisions of Section 8 of Proposition J. **(ACTION ITEM)**

8. **DIRECTORS' BUSINESS**
This item is designed to allow directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items at this time. **(DISCUSSION ONLY)**

McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1898

Phone: (415) 831-2727
Fax: (415) 831-2099

9. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
**At this time members of the public may address the Authority on items that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority and that do not appear on this agenda.**

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

## DISABILITY ACCESS

Room 408 is wheelchair accessible. The closest accessible BART Station is Civic Center, three blocks from City Hall. Accessible MUNI lines serving this location are: #42 Downtown Loop, the #71 Haight/Noriega and the F Line to Market and Van Ness and the Metro stations at Van Ness and Market and at Civic Center. For more information about MUNI services, call 923-6142. Large print agendas are available by calling the Authority Office at 415-831-2727. Sign language interpreters are available upon request by contacting 415-831-2774 at least two working days prior to a meeting. Individuals with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities should also call 415-831-2774. In order to assist the City's efforts to accommodate persons with severe allergies, environmental illnesses, multiple chemical sensitivity or related disabilities, attendees at public meetings are reminded that other attendees may be sensitive to various chemical based products. Please help the City accommodate these individuals. The TDD phone number for the Recreation and Park Department is 415-554-8922.

## KNOW YOUR RIGHTS UNDER THE SUNSHINE ORDINANCE

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review. For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Donna Hall at the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force in City Hall, Room 409 at 415-554-7724, fax 415-554-7854, or email donna_hall@ci.sf.ca.us.

## PROHIBITING THE USE OF SOUND-PRODUCING ELECTRONIC DEVICES

The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices. (Chapter 67A.1 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.)

For further information contact the Authority Office at 415-831-2727

## WRITTEN COMMENTS

**Persons attending the meeting and those unable to attend may submit written comments regarding the subject of the meeting. Such comments will be made part of the official public record and will be brought to the attention of the Authority. Written comments should be submitted to:**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

F
45
2
1/13/01

# FINAL MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 13TH, 2001 MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (the "Authority"), a California nonprofit corporation was held on November 13th, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. in Room 408, City Hall, San Francisco, California.

## 1. ROLL CALL:

The following directors, constituting a quorum, were present: President Nancy Conner, John Lum, Stephanie MacColl, Douglas Moran, and Margaret O'Sullivan. John Rizzo was absent. There being a quorum, the President called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

## 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, it was **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 9th, 2001.

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

JAN - 9 2002

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

## 3. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT:

**Project Overview**

CEO Ellzey provided a summary overview of the Authority's project activities, including an update of the design and approval phase of the underground parking facility in the Music Concourse area of Golden Gate Park.

CEO Ellzey provide some summary comments and suggested that there will be a comprehensive project update at the December meeting at which time he will review with the Board and the community the results of the last several months of work that has been done since receiving authorization to pursue that Schematic Design and EIR.

Much of the work that has been achieved in the past couple of months has been related to the initiation of the EIR process as the project team works to define the project(s) as described in Proposition J. The Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA) was filed on September 17th. There will be a full report on the EIR process next month including specific scoping discussions with the Planning Department.

The Transportation Implementation Action Plan under Section 8 of Proposition J has yielded remarkable results, which are discussed below as the Board is asked to approve the program and budget for the 2002

Design and coordination issues are still being discussed with the de Young and the Academy of Sciences. Some design issues that are being considered are of an historical nature and are being evaluated for the Music Concourse area as it relates to the greater Golden Gate Park. Access tunnels are being evaluated by civil engineers. There will be a broader update on these issues at the December meeting.

## 4. INTRA-PARK SHUTTLE PILOT PROGRAM – FINAL REPORT (YEAR ONE)

Ms. Marilyn Duffey, President of the Duffey Company, transportation consultants to the Authority, presented the final report on the first year of the two-year intra-park shuttle pilot program, which concluded October 28, 2001. Ms. Duffey reported on the success of the pilot

program and made recommendations for improvements for next year. She summarized some of the statistics and results of the onboard surveys that were handed to the riders by shuttle drivers. The pilot program had a ridership of over 5100 with a peak day of over 1000 riders. The survey showed that there was an even split among those who were from San Francisco, the Bay Area and out-of-town visitors. According to the surveys, one of the shortcomings of the pilot was a lack of promotion and marketing to the extent necessary to build ridership. Most of those who rode the shuttle found out about it from seeing it in the park. The survey also shows that many riders are taking public transportation to the park and then using the shuttle to visit park attractions. 65% of those surveyed said that they would pay $1 or more to ride the shuttle. 75% of the riders visited more than one place in the park. Many had trouble finding the shuttle stops and had they not seen the shuttle in the park, they would not have known about the shuttle. Most thought that the service was frequent enough, but many wanted a schedule. 94% of those surveyed liked the choice of the cable car lookalikes. 97% said that they would use the shuttle again and 95% would tell a friend.

Points for improvement are summarized in the report that is available for review on the website, www.goldengateparkconcourse.org. Overall, the pilot program was successful and there will be a second pilot program next Spring. Changes that are being planned for the next pilot include 100% ADA vehicles, development of a name or identity for the shuttle, route revisions, map revisions, and an on-board narrated tour. The pilot will be free for the next pilot in order to build ridership as well as an improved marketing plan.

The Board was very enthusiastic about the success of the pilot program (year one). Director MacColl asked Ms. Duffey to compare this pilot shuttle with other programs in which she has been involved. Ms. Duffey replied that this program appears successful for the first pilot, but she would like to see ridership double or triple for next year's pilot. This can be done through better advertising and marketing, and by starting the program earlier in the season. In response to Director O'Sullivan's inquiry regarding advertising in Muni bus shelters, Ms. Duffey replied that it is very expensive, but it would be looked into. The pilot was advertised on bus cards inside the buses, however.

Ms. Pinky Kushner from the Alliance for Golden Gate Park asked if the Intra-Park Shuttle Pilot Program final report would be part of the EIR. Mr. Michael Rice from EIP Associates replied that as part of Proposition J, the program would be analyzed as future conditions.

Mr. Phil Carleton with the Alliance for Golden Gate Park asked about the total cost for the year-one shuttle program. CEO Ellzey replied that the cost was $113,000 and any amount that is left over from the Proposition J monies for transportation purposes will be carried over to next year's programs. Mr. Carleton also has concerns that the drivers of the shuttles were driving in excess of 25mph.

## 5. Acceptance of a Gift-in-Kind for Operations and Services Rendered in Connection with Year One of the Two-Year IntraPark Shuttle Pilot Program

CEO Ellzey recommended that the Concourse Authority board of directors accept a gift-in-kind in the amount of $113,000, which reflects total expenditures for services and operation for the first year of the intra-park shuttle pilot program. Of the $150,000 set aside for transportation improvement implementation in accordance with the Section 8 requirement of Proposition J, $113,000 was expended for operations and services for the year one IntraPark Shuttle Pilot Program, the balance to be carried over to next year's programs.

After a brief discussion about the cost and budget of the pilot program, there was a motion made, seconded and unanimously carried, and it was **RESOLVED** to accept a gift-in-kind for operations and services rendered in connection with year one of the two-year intra-park shuttle pilot program.

**6. RECEIVE AND ACCEPT THE GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY EIR TRANSPORTATION DATA COLLECTION (PARKING – EXISTING CONDITIONS) STUDY.**

CEO Ellzey recommended that the Concourse Authority board of directors accept the "existing conditions" parking study as the "baseline" parking space inventory from which parking spaces removed from Golden Gate Park pursuant to the provisions for Proposition J will be subtracted.

Mr. Michael Rice from EIP Associates reviewed the comprehensive existing conditions survey that was conducted by Wilbur Smith Associates. The goal of the survey was to develop a comprehensive, existing parking inventory and occupancy survey during a summer period. The goal was also to take the survey at different days of the week to document the parking occupancy throughout the park that occurs on weekdays, weekends, free Wednesdays, etc. and document the varying volumes of parking conditions that exist during different activities that go on in Golden Gate Park.

There were some questions and comments from the Board regarding the layout of the survey and the nature of the interface between the Concourse Authority and RecPark. President Conner replied that the Authority is required to remove a space for every space constructed in the garage. However, under the provisions of Proposition J, actions taken by the Authority are forwarded to the RecPark Commission for ultimate disposition.

Four members of the public, (Mr. Chris Duderstadt, Ms. Pinky Kushner, Mr. Phil Carleton, and Ms. Mary Anne Miller from the Alliance for Golden Gate Park and San Francisco Tomorrow) felt that approval of the parking survey was premature. The reasons stated are as follows:

- Some of the data appears to be wrong
- RecPark may not have seen the document and should have a chance to review
- The widths of the roads may not have been taken into account
- Scheduled road closures were counted along with the parking space inventory
- It was purported that the survey was not made available to the public in time
- Some felt that the presentation was unprofessional
- The Board should have more time to look at the document
- Spaces in which no one ever parks should not be taken into account
- Large areas in the Park seem to have been grouped together that deserve separate consideration
- 0 -59% is too broad a category to accurately describe the parking usage in some areas
- The survey may have room for improvement prior to going before RecPark

The Concourse Authority consultant team stated that the survey would be forwarded to the RecPark Commission for disposition, as provided in Proposition J. Any comments received by the public subsequent to this action would be submitted to Wilbur Smith and considered for inclusion prior to submitting the survey to the Commission. In this requested action, the Authority board is being asked to accept the survey as the first step toward determining a "baseline," or beginning point, for removing parking spaces as stipulated in Proposition J.

President Conner felt that the survey may need to be reviewed further before this Board accepts it and recommended that the Authority revisit this item next month before recommending it to RecPark.

**7. Approve Program and Budget for Transportation Action Plan for Implementation for Fiscal 2002.**

CEO Ellzey recommended that the Concourse Authority board of directors approve a resolution which sets forth a budget and program for transportation improvement programs to be implemented pursuant to the Golden Gate Park Master Plan and the provisions of Section 8 of Proposition J.

The following description that has been developed of each of the programs under Section 8 for evaluation and potential implementation during the course of the next year is in the form of the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION for Adoption**

**by the**

**Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority**
**for the**
**TRANSPORTATION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN-2001 TO 2002**

**WHEREAS,** Section 2 of Proposition J gives the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority (Authority) all of the rights, powers, privileges, immunities, authorities and duties necessary or appropriate to: ( c ) "study, recommend and, working with appropriate City departments and commissions, implement traffic, transit and infrastructure plans, programs, policies, goals and improvements relating to the Concourse area and the remainder of the Park as necessary or appropriate to facilitate a park that is accessible to all of the public, including, without limitation, families, children and young people, seniors, and persons with disabilities, and is safe for all recreational users, including, but not limited to, preparation of a feasibility and implementation plan as provided in Section 8 of the ordinance;" and

**WHEREAS,** Section 8 of Proposition J states that the feasibility study and implementation plan shall "encompass, but not be limited to: an intra-park shuttle system for all attractions within Golden Gate Park; access to the Park road system from the northern side of the Park; traffic "calming" measures to mitigate 'highway-type' traffic patterns, including, without limitation, consideration of cul-de-sacs and other roadway improvements; time-limited parking throughout the Park on weekdays to discourage non-Park commuter use; a "cultural shuttle" carrying visitors from major downtown and transit locations to and from the Park; bicycle and skating lanes and paths within the Park; road closures within the Park in accordance with the Golden Gate Park master plan (adopted pursuant to Section 10 of the Ordinance); expanded use of the nearby hospital garages via shuttle for overflow use; Municipal Railway service improvements; and traffic, roadway, landscaping, and other infrastructure improvements to facilitate transition to a Golden Gate Park where the automobile is increasingly less visible;" and

**WHEREAS,** a number of these transportation improvements have been addressed in the Golden Gate Park Master Plan and Certified Environmental Impact Report (July 9, 1998); and

**WHEREAS,** the Authority has reviewed and considered information in the Transportation Feasibility Study (February 13, 2001), and the Draft Transportation Actions for Implementation (September 20, 2001), and has received public input at the September 9, 2001 Authority Meeting and has revised the Transportation Actions for Implementation (October 25, 2001) to respond to comments; and

**WHEREAS,** the Authority has previously caused to have appropriated and set aside $150,000 of private funds for implementation of transportation actions during plan year 2000-2001 pursuant to Section 8 of Proposition J, and

**WHEREAS,** the Authority has caused or will have caused to have appropriated and set aside $200,000 of private funds for the implementation of transportation actions during plan year 2001-2002 pursuant to Section 8 of Proposition J;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that the Authority is adopting for implementation the following transportation actions:

1) a Phase 2 Intra-Park Shuttle Pilot Program to operate from March to October 2002 on weekends and holidays on 15-mninute headways using a combination of San Francisco Transportation Authority grant funds of $100,000 from the Clean Air Program, and $50,000 of private funds provided to the Authority, to prepare a Request for Proposal, select an operator, administer and market the program, operate the pilot program, prepare a report, and begin planning for a permanent, sustainable intra-park shuttle program. ***(Authority Budget: $50,000)***
2) a parking management program to be implemented cooperatively with the Recreation and Park Department staff and other city departments, beginning with the 3 and 4-hour time-limited parking as described in the approved Golden Gate Park Master Plan and EIR for Concourse area roads, by holding informational meetings with institutions, neighborhood residents and local businesses, posting and mailing notices, fabricating and installing signs in the Park and working with park patrols or DPT to enforce parking limitations. ***(Authority Budget $50,000)***
3) a scope of work and selection of a landscape architect to develop concept designs for narrowing travel lanes on JFK Drive, MLK Drive, and other major park throughfares; hold public workshops to review concept designs, and select a preferred traffic-calming design to implement in 2003. ***(Authority Budget: $25,000)***
4) pedestrian safety improvements at crosswalk locations as coordinated with and approved by Recreation and Park Department at an estimated 100 locations in the Park; and monitor vehicle response. ***(Authority Budget: $15,000)***
5) work cooperatively with the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition to plan and implement bicycle improvements in Golden Gate Park. ***(Authority Budget: $15,000)***
6) assist Recreation and Park Department in road closures as described in the approved Golden Gate Park Master Plan and EIR; post notices 30 days in advance of the closures; fabricate and place closure signs and install bollards to keep vehicles off roads, and enforce the closure. Monitor and report parking and traffic circulation changes. *(Authority Budget: $20,000)*

7) retain a consultant to design a cultural shuttle pilot program for implementation and funding in 2003. ***(Authority Budget: $30,000)***
8) work cooperatively with MUNI to enhance and market transit routes to Golden Gate Park ***(Authority Budget: $25,000);***

**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** that the $7000 unallocated balance be reserved as a contingency fund to be used, as necessary, for the implementation plan.

Director O'Sullivan asked about the cultural shuttle program and has concerns as to the economical feasibility. CEO Ellzey said that what the Board is asked to approve is a planning budget to determine its feasibility and to identify funding necessary for the implementation of a cultural shuttle. Ms. Duffey added that a cultural shuttle has been discussed in some detail already, and it had been decided that it would be best to implement the intra-park shuttle prior to the cultural shuttle. She reported that a cultural shuttle does have potential funding, because it would tie in with existing transit so there is transit money available. The idea is to link existing transit nodes with Golden Gate Park.

President Conner asked for some clarification regarding the intra-park shuttle, traffic calming and road closures.

Mr. Chris Duderstadt asked about the breadth of the Concourse Authority's jurisdiction in the Park. President Conner replied that the Section 8 improvements as part of Proposition J are park-wide.

There being no further comment on this item; on motion duly made, seconded and unanimously approved, the above resolution was adopted.

## 8. Directors' Business:

**This item allows the directors to raise issues they believe the Authority should address at future meetings. There will be no discussion of these items.**

There was none.

## 9. Public Comment

There was none.

## 10. Adjournment:

There being no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

# GOLDEN GATE PARK CONCOURSE AUTHORITY

F
45
1
2/11/01
ncelled

Willie L. Brown, Jr., *Mayor*

Nancy Rowe Conner
John Lum
Stephanie Chase MacColl
Douglas Moran
Margaret O'Sullivan
John Rizzo

## NOTICE OF CANCELLED MEETING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Regular meeting of the Golden Gate Park Concourse Authority scheduled for Tuesday, December 11, 2001 at 4:30 p.m. at City Hall in Room 408 has been cancelled.

12-06-01P04:27 RCVD

DOCUMENTS DEPT.

DEC - 6 2001

SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC LIBRARY

**McLaren Lodge, Golden Gate Park**
**501 Stanyan Street**
**San Francisco, CA 94117-1898**

**Phone: (415) 831-2727**
**Fax: (415) 831-2099**